The Communist

20c. MARCH 1941

Copy A

EARL BROWDER
HEROIC LEADER OF THE PEOPLE

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

WE REPRESENT THE FUTURE

EARL BROWDER

•

WORLD CAPITALISM AND WORLD SOCIALISM

22

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

COMMUNISTS AND CHINA'S THREE PEOPLE'S PRINCIPLES

MAO TSE-TUNG

•

STALIN—GENIUS OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

DONALD MACKENZIE LESTER

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Book by the Foremost Spokesman and Fighter for Peace in the Western Hemisphere—

THE WAY OUT

BY EARL BROWDER

Earl Browder is acknowledged to be the strongest and clearest voice for peace in the Western Hemisphere. In this collection of his most recent speeches and articles are mirrored the unflinching leadership and vanguard role of the Party which he heads in the struggle of the people's forces against the second imperialist war. Dealing with problems of American foreign policy, the growing reaction of the Roosevelt-Wall Street ruling cliques, the intensified assaults on the wage and living standards and democratic rights of labor and the people, the imperialist objectives of monopoly capital in the United States, the meaning of the "opposition" of certain sections of the ruling class to the Lend-Lease Bill, the nefarious role of the Social-Democratic agents of Big Business in their attempts to harness labor to the war plans of Wall Street, all these are brilliantly discussed in this new book by Earl Browder.

Coming on the heels of a brutal four-year sentence because of his uncompromising fight against every step leading to war, Browder's militant message of struggle for peace, security and democracy has greater significance than ever for all progressive Americans. In these pages, America's most potent voice for peace continues to speak out in defense of the fundamental interests of the vast majority of the people.

256 Pages. Price $1.00

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EARL BROWDER
General Secretary, Communist Party, U.S.A.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
National Chairman, Communist Party, U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XX, No. 3 MARCH, 1941

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Earl Browder Remains the Heroic Leader of the People	*William Z. Foster*	195
We Represent the Future	*Earl Browder*	197
Editorials		202
The National Committee of the Communist Party Hails William Z. Foster on his 60th Birthday		218
World Capitalism and World Socialism	*William Z. Foster*	220
The Communists and China's Three People's Principles	*Mao Tse-tung*	238
Stalin—Genuis of Socialist Construction	*Donald MacKenzie Lester*	257
Stuart Chase's Nostrums for Dying Capitalism	*Frank Meyer*	276

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street.), New York. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months: foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THIS LETTER TEELS WHY—

THE SOVIET POWER

THE SOCIALIST SIXTH OF THE WORLD

BY HEWLETT JOHNSON, DEAN OF CANTERBURY

is establishing new records as America's outstanding BEST SELLER!

"It is great news—the best of news—that the Dean of Canterbury's book, THE SOVIET POWER, is now available at the low price of 35 cents. This means that the book can reach masses of people with its message of what socialism means and how it has brought to the population of a great nation jobs, security, opportunity for the widest culture—for all the things that enrich life and make it worth while and of which our capitalist system deprives so many of us.

"And why can we rejoice that such a book is available—a book that will put to shame the false statements of a Chamberlain, a Lyons, a Freda Utley, paid agents of a decaying system?

"Well, because it is written by a non-Communist—so partisan prejudice can be counted out; by an Englishman—for English opinion just now seems to have double weight; by a distinguished Churchman, which to many stamps truthfulness on its statements; and also by a man who, before he became a Church dignitary, received a scientific education and was an engineer of note."

—ANITA WHITNEY

Fourth Printing—Total 300,000 Copies!

ONLY 35¢

THREE FOR A DOLLAR!

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EARL BROWDER REMAINS THE HEROIC LEADER OF THE PEOPLE

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
National Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

IT IS true that the Supreme Court, in its august dignity and sublime hypocrisy, has approved the four-year sentence against Earl Browder.

It is true that he is to be taken to a prison cell to start serving that term, torn away from the people's movement of which he is the leader.

It is true that the Communist Party, the working class, and the authentic progressive forces of the country have suffered a profound blow in being deprived of the personal and direct leadership from day to day of their best spokesman.

But who has lost most in this ordeal?

The Supreme Court and the whole judiciary have lost, as the long run will show. For it had to stoop to the cheap device of using a trivial technicality in order to "get" the man who had been marked for political persecution by the whole War Party.

Everyone knows that Earl Browder was convicted and sentenced because of his position and the position of the Party which he leads on the war. It is an admission of bankruptcy and defeat that the war leaders could not meet him on his own high political grounds. They had to use a petty subterfuge, and in doing so they exposed the real class nature of the judiciary and of the war itself.

The warmongers have lost. The neat and intricate filigree with which they adorn the imperialist war, the pretty designs knit out of words about democracy and civilization and freedom with which they dress up their own imperialist ambitions, are worn away as if by a potent acid.

The people will prove to be the gainers. From this sentence they will learn to understand better the real nature of the ruling class and its prostitution of the people's democracy. From this sentence they will understand better the war aims and the colossal imperialist ambitions of the rulers of America.

This sentence has already sent an alarm out among the people; for it shows to them vividly how rapidly Roosevelt is preparing to send the fleet into battle and to dispatch a new A.E.F.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Earl Browder in jail is a burning indictment of the "leaders" who have betrayed the people.

Earl Browder in jail is a vindication of the true fight which he leads, the fight for peace, security and socialism.

Earl Browder in jail is a reaffirmation of the principle of proletarian internationalism, of solidarity with the peoples of the world in their enduring struggle against war and imperialism. For even the passport technicality upon which the sentence was based arose out of Browder's activities in support of the Chinese people in their struggle for independence.

Earl Browder in jail is a reaffirmation of the love and support of the Soviet Union among the peoples of the world, of their great faith in this first land of socialism.

Earl Browder in jail is a vindication of all that is noblest in the great American tradition. The tradition of Jefferson, Tom Paine, Lincoln, John Brown, Eugene Debs has never been in the hands of the jailers. Today it is in the hands of Earl Browder, the prisoner.

Earl Browder in jail is a challenge to all that is best in America. It is a challenge to wipe out this shame upon the land. It is a challenge to the working people to take their fate into their own hands.

"The doddering old gentlemen who represent a doddering old system," said Browder in one of his farewell speeches, "may be able to start the war, but the masses—and above all the young people—will put an end to the war and with it the system which brought it about."

That is profoundly true. The masses whom Browder inspired with his insight and his vision will make it a reality.

For, what Earl Browder stands for is as big as the world. And there is no jailer, no matter how powerful, who can imprison the world.

We take up the challenge. Our ranks have been strengthened by the many who have lost their illusions as the result of the persecution of Comrade Browder. Our ranks will be further strengthened by a staunch fight for a people's government and a people's peace. The workers of America and their Communist vanguard will grow stronger in the fight to obtain the immediate and unconditional release of Comrade Browder.

Earl Browder remains the heroic leader of the people. With him the people will be victorious.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WE REPRESENT THE FUTURE

BY EARL BROWDER

(Address Delivered at Mecca Temple, New York City, Feb. 24, 1941.)

COMRADES: First of all, I want to apologize for coming here unprepared to make a speech. I have been busy the last few days getting ready to go away to camp. My number came up and so I am having something like the experience of millions of Americans today. Practically every home in America is waiting to see when the number is coming up that takes away one or more members of the family; and the cause is the same. All America is going through this experience. It is true that the other boys are being told they are going for one year, but just the other day one of the higher ranking generals of the United States Army told a gathering of conscripts in one of the camps: "Forget about that nonsense of one year; you are in for the duration." And that is the decision of the representatives of the American ruling class down in Washington. They have taken us in "for the duration."

I am over the draft age, so they had to find a special reason for drafting me and our good friend and comrade William Wiener, and they found special reasons for drafting quite a few more. But these reasons are of the same validity and the same character of which every fascist dictatorship has proceeded to silence the opposition.

They say that I am going because I committed a crime. It is true that it was many years ago and it did not injury anybody. I only used some names to which I was not legally entitled in order to get certain rights of travel to which I was entitled—a technical question, no harm to anybody involved; but by fine-spun legal sophistry which has been endorsed by the Supreme Court, this whole technical business, which even Herbert Hoover had discarded, was dug out of the pigeonholes by the Roosevelt Administration as a convenient pretext for giving the signal for a general all-round offensive against the rights and liberties and well-being and peace of the whole American people. They say I used a fraudulent passport. It happens that the passport was in my own name and merely secured me entry into the United States to which I was completely entitled with or without a passport. Nobody was deceived, as well as nobody injured.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But there are some false passports which do great injury. I was just recalling a while ago that there is an old song that used to be very popular in America from that Gilbert and Sullivan opera—I think it is The Mikado—where the Lord High Executioner sings about making the punishment fit the crime. I wonder, if my kind of crime rates four years in prison, what should be the punishment for a man who got a false passport by deceiving the whole American people? I refer to Franklin D. Roosevelt, who got his passport for a third term by promising to keep America out of this imperialist war and then violating that promise. There is a false passport that is not a mere technicality. There is a false passport whereby its bearer got admittance to a third term to the Presidency to which he was not entitled and which violated 150 years' tradition of the American republic, an admittance which he could never have got if he had not sworn falsely before the whole American people.

If my passport offense rates four years, what is the punishment that fits the crime of Franklin D. Roosevelt against the American people? I think the punishment that will inevitably be inflicted for that crime—the supreme punishment—will be written by history, which will write down that name as the man who betrayed the peace and prosperity of the American people.

They used to say in the old days —how long ago it seems—when the Administration was bucking the economic royalists in America, that Mr. Roosevelt was a traitor to his class. Well, now the prodigal has returned. He has gone back to his class. The fatted calf was killed in honor of his return. Some millions of American boys are going to be thrown into the sacrifice to make it a real celebration; and today he truly represents his class.

But it is a class which has long outlived its role in history. It has nothing more to contribute except war, conscription, dictatorship, destruction of the rights and livelihood of the people, catastrophe, famine, pestilence and chaos, which are spreading rapidly over the face of the earth and drawing ever closer to our own shores.

We are not overwhelmed by this prospect, however. The forces of war and reaction seem to be overwhelmingly strong and we who stand out against it seem to be quite a small minority group. But we are not dismayed by this. Strange as it may seem, to those who see only the surface of events, it is not we of this small minority who lie awake at nights. I sleep quite soundly myself. I have the impression that most Communists sleep quite soundly at night. And yet I hear that there is a great epidemic of insomnia among the bourgeoisie. Down in Washington bedclothes are being torn by fat bodies tossing around. Perhaps you think the conscience of these gentlemen is troubling them. Here and there there is a vestige of conscience playing its part. Even the smallest remnant of a conscience is sufficient to keep some of these gentlemen awake all night month after month. Most of them got rid of their conscience long ago, however. The thing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that keeps them awake, the thing that denies them rest is that they have been trying to look into the future.

They gaze into their crystal ball and, try as they will, they cannot figure out where their world is going to. They can't see any future except the intensification of starvation, war, pestilence, destruction, chaos. They hire their scribblers, their Norman Thomases, to sooth the people with stories of the beautiful world that is going to come after the war, but they bought that stuff so they don't believe it themselves. They can see no future and they know that the day of reckoning is coming. They know that the people will not remain forever patient; they know that for all their great powers they are completely helpless in the face of the sweep of events. They are even beginning to realize that the more energetically they carry out their policies, the more surely they come to collapse. They are beginning to realize that their trouble is some fatal internal contradictions. They can no more escape from them than a man can lift himself by his bootstraps. And they realize that the people are beginning to understand that the only way out of this bloody mess that imperialism is creating in the world is the way out of capitalism, the way to a new, socialist world.

The majority of the American people do not understand socialism; they do not as yet understand that war and capitalism are inseparable. We still have to teach them that, but we have powerful aids in this teaching today. The government in Washington is helping us to teach the American people this way out. The whole capitalist press is helping us to teach the people this great lesson today. In spite of the fact that the newspapers are filled from beginning to end with lies designed to hide this great truth, it emerges clearer and clearer even in the pages of the capitalist press. Any honest man and lover of peace reading this press day after day, even before he gets a hold of our rapidly spreading Communist literature, cannot but come to the conclusion that if he wants peace he must join with his fellow men to wipe out this system that produces such a rotten and corrupt press as our newspapers in America today.

So we face the future with great confidence. The future always presents itself as a small minority. It is only with the development of a great historic crisis that new majorities come into being and new courses are taken by history. Not every minority becomes a majority and it is not because we are a minority that we are the representatives of the future. I could name you plenty of minorities that have very little chance in the future. But we have very solid reasons for believing that we are the minority that represents the future.

It is first of all because we are that minority which is working, fighting, organizing to achieve what the overwhelming majority of the American people want—to get out and stay out of the imperialist war. And also another solid reason is our calm confidence in the future, that we represent that party and that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

program which is already realizing that future in the socialist one-sixth of the earth, the Soviet Union.

I wonder how many of you read the report in the *Sunday Worker* on the 1940 development of Soviet economy, the report delivered at the recent conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. If I were a capitalist, or if I were a member of Roosevelt's cabinet, and read that report, I am afraid that the result might be that I would lock myself up in a room like a certain rather famous gentleman; but, of course, if I were a member of Roosevelt's cabinet and I read that report I probably wouldn't understand it, so it wouldn't make any difference.

But here in the midst of a world where the great powers, the great historic aggregation of the political leadership of the human race, the great aggregation of wealth, the great institutions of science and learning, the churches, the movies, the newspapers, the radio, the armies and the navies and the air fleets are all mobilized for destruction, killing, bombing, machine-gunning, torpedoing, blowing the world to bits, throwing whole continents into pestilence and death—all they have to say to their own people is, fight on to victory. And victory means beginning the cycle all over again. In the midst of that, here is a great country, one-sixth of the world, which, despite the most elaborate conspiracy and provocation that history has ever seen, has managed to keep itself out of this bloody chaos, has already managed to rescue 23,000,000 of its most immediate neighbors.

While destruction goes on in the rest of the world the Soviet Union is building its new economy at a rate never witnessed before in history, and it keeps up this rate in the midst of a world at war. And now, the other day, at the recent Party conference they began to elaborate a new stage in the development of that new society; they began to draw up a fifteen-year plan. They are now finishing the Third Five-Year Plan. That of the next fifteen years is going to be a plan made in one piece, and in those fifteen years, the next fifteen, the Soviet Union is going to overtake and surpass, economically as well as in every other respect, every other country in the world, including the United States. Of course, we have heard of plans and plans and plans, and to speak of a plan in most cases means to speak of some empty promise, like Roosevelt's fraudulent promise to keep America out of this war. But through three Five-Year Plans in the Soviet Union we have learned to expect that not only are the plans fulfilled; the plans are over-fulfilled.

We are not yet in a position to do for our country what the Communists have been able to do for the great territories of the Soviet Union. The same sort of program for America would bring much quicker and greater results, because here in this country we already have the material pre-conditions for socialism, the material conditions that they can only create over long years and painful effort over there. Here these conditions were created by capitalism before it grew old and senile

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and died on its feet and began to stink. But in America, once the people take control of their own destiny, take control of their own country, take control of their own economy, and eliminate these war-making parasites who strangle our country economically, who corrupt it culturally and politically, and who now threaten to destroy it in the imperialist war—once we get rid of these parasites, America can overnight be transformed into a garden of prosperity and security and peace.

We know that the American people will not forever and not for long submit themselves to this kind of system and this kind of leadership. Our own ruling class can launch us into this war, but they cannot end it. The American people can end it; the American people will end it, and the American people will find the way to this all the quicker because the American people have produced already a Communist Party, a party with roots among the masses, a party that can never be separated from the American masses, a party that will always be at work among the American masses, a party that will organize and lead the American people to peace and to socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIALS

WHAT DO WE LEARN FROM THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE LEND-LEASE BILL?

THE struggle against the Lend-Lease Bill has disclosed several things of vital importance to the peace movements of the American people. It has shown that the overwhelming mass of the nation continues to be opposed to the war-involvement policy of the ruling imperialist circles; but that this opposition is being seriously weakened, on the one hand, by the still prevailing illusions, spread and cultivated by the Roosevelts and the Hillman-Green reformist leaders, that this is an anti-fascist and democratic war, and, on the other hand, by the peace demagogy of the Hoover-Lindbergh-Vandenberg section of imperialism, supported by the "isolationists" (hemisphere imperialists) of the Wheeler-Nye group and the reformist leaders of the Norman Thomas type. It follows, therefore, that the major task of the peace movements of the people is to dissipate the illusions spread by the Roosevelt-Willkie interventionists, to expose systematically the peace demagogy of the Lindberghs and Vandenbergs, to awaken and organize the activities *of the masses themselves* on the independent line of struggle against the imperialist war, against the growing capitalist reaction, for a people's peace.

We are still in the early phases of this momentous struggle. It is not to be expected, therefore, that the anti-imperialist and peace forces of the country will be certain to score complete victories on the individual issues arising in the course of this struggle. Not yet, considering the existing relation of forces between the imperialists and anti-imperialists. Much still has to be done to create the conditions for such victories: in the struggle for the class unity of the American proletariat, in the building of the anti-imperialist people's peace front, in defeating Social-Democratism and reformist influences in the labor movement and among the masses generally. And herein lies the *chief* importance of the many significant struggles on individual issues against the war and reactionary offensive of the imperialists that labor and its allies have been waging since the outbreak of the war. It is in these struggles against the imperialist offensive that the American working class is moving to the achievement of its class unity, is freeing itself from reformist influences, and is cementing its alliance with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rest of the working people in a united anti-imperialist peace front. It is in these daily struggles against the imperialist offensive of the bourgeoisie, and only through these, that the masses have found and will continue to find a measure of defense and protection of their immediate interests, *at the same time* acquiring power and consciousness to achieve greater and more significant victories. The important thing is to wage these struggles in such a way as really to build the people's power for greater victories.

From this standpoint one must evaluate also the struggle against the so-called Lend-Lease Bill. At this writing, the bill has already passed the House; and knowing the composition of the Senate, one can safely predict its passage there too. Thus, by the time the American People's Meeting, called by the American Peace Mobilization (APM), assembles in New York on April 5-6, this particular stage of the anti-war struggle—the fight against the adoption of the Lend-Lease Bill by Congress—will be practically over. Which means that the general anti-war struggle will move on *to the next stage.*

In this next stage the people's peace movements will face new difficulties: a faster rate of *further* war involvement and military collaboration with British imperialism as well as sharper attacks on the economic standards and civil rights of the masses. This must be anticipated. On the other hand, the people's peace movements will also face new opportunities for stronger and more effective defense of the interests of the masses: the masses are now more widely aroused to the dangers confronting them; they demonstrate a greater readiness to unite for common struggle; and the more advanced sections of the anti-imperialist camp, *with the growing leading role of progressive labor,* are acquiring greater internal cohesion and wider influence. And all of these new opportunities have been augmented precisely in the struggle against the adoption by Congress of the Lend-Lease Bill.

In other words, the imperialists and warmongers have acquired in this bill an additional and powerful weapon for the promotion of the offensive against their imperialist rivals abroad and against the masses of the people at home. But the masses of the people, in the struggle against the adoption of this bill, have also acquired new positions and new opportunities. The task now is to make good and full use of them.

How can this be done? First of all by a more systematic and more skillful exposure *of the imperialist and predatory nature* of the war and reactionary offensive of the American bourgeoisie, and of all its sections. Because just as long as wide masses of our people continue with the illusion that the Anglo-American imperialists are waging an anti-fascist and democratic war, that the Roosevelt interventionists are fighting for world peace and freedom, just so long will the peace movements encounter serious difficulties in developing the fighting *self-activity* of wider masses; of the same masses who are unmistakably

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opposed to further military involvement. But this is not all. There is also another set of illusions. It is the spreading belief among other masses that the Hoover-Lindbergh-Landon section of imperialism is a genuine champion of peace. Therefore: just as long as these beliefs continue to spread and prevail among substantial sections of the people, just so long will the genuine anti-war movements be facing serious obstacles to making the necessary advances for significant victories; just so long will important anti-war currents among the masses continue to be drained off into imperialist and reactionary channels.

Among the harmful consequences resulting from failure to expose thoroughly the imperialist character of the so-called "appeasers," there is also another one. To the extent that the struggle for peace is allowed to become *identified* in the eyes of certain sections of our people with such imperialist and reactionary tendencies as are represented by the Fords, Lindberghs and Hoovers, to that extent certain of the less active anti-imperialist forces tend to hang on to the Roosevelts and Hillmans and Greens, despite the reactionary and war policies of this section of imperialism and reformism. These unwilling and uncertain followers of the Roosevelts and Hillmans probably reason like this: if the only way to peace and progress is through supporting the Lindbergh-Hoover-Ford-Landon section of imperialism, then we had better stay a little while longer with the Roosevelts, or perhaps stay with nobody.

It all comes down therefore to this one general proposition. The anti-imperialist peace forces of the people must achieve *greater success* in the exposure of the central fact that the bourgeoisie of the United States, *as a class*, regardless of existing sharp divisions and differences, is set on a course of imperialist aggrandizement by war abroad and of reactionary dictatorship against the people at home; and that the various groupings in the reformist, and Social-Democratic leadership—one set tied up with the Roosevelts and Willkies, another set with the Hoovers, Lindberghs and Vandenbergs—are working with the imperialist bourgeoisie for war and reaction. Yes, we must achieve more substantial successes in this campaign of exposure through incomparably *deeper penetration of the masses* with the anti-imperialist message and struggles. Only thus will larger and larger sections of the people become convinced of the need of breaking away from the imperialist bourgeoisie and their reformist servants. Only thus will wide masses of the people enter more *actively* the major struggle of our time—the struggle for peace, freedom and security.

The current preparations for the American People's Meeting against the war present a good opportunity for this kind of deeper penetration of the masses. And this is true not on general grounds but on some very specific ones. It is evident that the struggle against the adoption of the Lend-Lease Bill by Con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gress has aroused wide sections of labor and its allies to the new dangers of deeper military war involvement and sharper attacks on the economic and civil standards of the masses. This means that the preparations for the American People's Meeting will find the masses more alert to the anti-imperialist peace message and more ready *to join in organization and activity* for the promotion of the aims of the people's peace movement. It is on this realistic expectation that the April 5-6 action must be based. Among wide masses of the people—workers, toiling farmers, youth, Negroes—there is now a much clearer realization than heretofore of the inseparable connection between further military war involvement and sharper attacks on the economic standards and civil liberties of the masses. Nothing since the outbreak of the war has done so much to bring about this clearer realization than the struggle around the Lend-Lease Bill, a bill which literally *embodies* this connection between imperialist war abroad and capitalist attacks on the masses at home.

It can therefore be safely assumed that the workers in the industries will be showing not only an increasingly greater determination to fight for the protection and improvement of their wage standards and general working conditions, for which major movements are now on foot; *not only* a firmer willingness to fight for the independence of their unions, for the protection of their general civil liberties, for the right to strike and full freedom of collective bargaining; *but also,* and in much larger measure than heretofore, they will be showing a readiness to enter the fight to get out and stay out of the imperialist war, to combat every step for further war involvement, to join the mass movements in other countries (like the People's Convention in England) in the struggle for a people's peace. And this is true, in varying degrees, for the youth, the toiling farmers, the Negro masses, the toiling women.

And what does this mean for the preparations of the American People's Meeting? It means at least these three things: First, that wider masses than ever before can be won to active participation in the elections of delegates to the meeting and to the formulation and adoption of instructions for these delegates. This can be done not only in general mass meetings, but also in meetings of various progressive mass organizations, in shops and factories, in neighborhoods, on the farms. Secondly, that *permanent* peace organizations (committees, councils, etc.) can be crystallized in most places in the process of electing and instructing the delegates to the American People's Meeting, permanent bodies to which the delegates will report back and which will carry forward the decisions and plans of the meeting. Many trade unions already have such peace committees. Thirdly, that the message to the people in these preparations (literature, speeches, etc.) must concentrate on exposing the imperialist and reactionary nature of the war policies of both main sections of the Amer-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican bourgeoisie, on combating the reformist servants of the bourgeoisie, on bringing forward the role and responsibilities of a united working class in the leadership of the anti-imperialist people's peace movements.

Thus will the masses be helped to enter the new stage in the struggle for peace, security and freedom.

AMERICAN IMPERIALIST OBJECTIVES VERSUS FAKE ISSUES

ONE of the "big" questions dividing the American bourgeoisie, according to the discussion on the Lend-Lease Bill, is whether or not this country can be invaded by the Axis Powers. However, the truth is that this question is neither big nor is it a point of division in the camp of the imperialists. It is a false issue, which both imperialist camps have seized upon with a purpose, with the purpose of hiding the things that unite them as well as those on which they really differ.

Here is a tip from *The United States News*, usually well informed on prevailing trends in ruling circles. It writes:

"Idea that military invasion will be tried on this country is not entertained. *Privately*, experts say that invasion is highly improbable. *Publicly*, they mention invasion as a means of jolting public opinion to realization of danger." (Jan. 31, 1941.)

In other words, it is a fake issue used by both main imperialist groupings to alarm the masses, to confuse them, to hide from them the fact that they are *agreed* on the main purposes of imperialist expansion and war aggrandizement while differing on questions of estimate, timing and methods. These latter questions can, of course, be a source of very sharp internal struggle in the imperialist camp; a source of struggle which a united and independent anti-imperialist camp can make great use of for the fight against *the entire course* of the imperialist bourgeoisie. And that's what *The New York Times*, for example, is afraid of, and therefore urges "unity," unity of the imperialists against the masses of the people. But this merely emphasizes the point that the Roosevelts and Willkies on the one hand and the Lindberghs and Hoovers on the other are agreed on a course of imperialist war aggrandizement abroad and internal reaction at home.

For if that was not so, why didn't the so-called appeasers raise the real and basic questions? To mention only a few: Why do the American people have to have *domination* (economic, political and military) of the Western Hemisphere? Why do the American workers, farmers, and toilers generally—the real nation—have to prepare to fight for *control* of the seas, especially the Atlantic and Pacific? Surely, these are some of the imperialist objectives that lie at bottom of the whole "national" defense drive and of the war policies of the Government. These are some of the major objectives for the achievement of which the Lend-Lease Bill has been framed. Yet none of the bourgeois

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"opposition" to the bill dared challenge these objectives. Why? Simply because they are in agreement with these imperialist objectives.

Just examine closely Secretary Hull's statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee (Jan. 15) from the viewpoint of American imperialist objectives. He said:

"The most serious question today for this country is whether the control of the high seas shall pass into the hands of powers bent on a program of unlimited conquest."

The conclusion from that is that we must wage war—nothing less—to gain that control for ourselves. Did the "opposition" challenge that? No. They accepted it.

Further—from Secretary Hull:

"Control of the high seas by law-abiding nations is the key to the security of the Western Hemisphere in the present day world situation. Should that control be gained by the partners of the tripartite pact, the danger to our country, great as it is today, would be multiplied manyfold."

In plain language this means that we have to have domination of the Western Hemisphere (exploitation and oppression of the peoples and nations of this part of the world), and to maintain that domination we must have control of the high seas; and, in the "present world situation," which is an imperialist war for the redivision of the world, we have *to wage war* to achieve these objectives. Nothing less than war, and nothing "cheaper," despite the pretensions of the *New York Herald Tribune* that "rarely has any people had the opportunity to achieve so much at so little actual risk," meaning the opportunity "to guide their own future and the future of the world." (Feb. 4.)

Little risk, indeed. Just as little as it will take to smash the military power of "the partners of the tripartite pact." And that is the course of the American imperialist bourgeoisie and of its Government which dictated the Lend-Lease Bill. But did the bourgeois "opposition" challenge this course? No. They did not. They agreed with it in substance. And why? Because they are imperialists, and *as such,* they can have no other answer to their imperialist rivals in this war situation than to drag the United States into the fight for world power and domination (the high seas, the Far East, the Western Hemisphere, etc.). This is so, for the fundamental reason that capitalism produces imperialism and imperialist rivalries which, when they become as acute as they are now, due to the decay of the capitalist system and the contradiction between it and the growing world of socialism, force the bourgeoisie to resort to war and internal reaction as a solution.

These columns have already discussed the nature of the differences between the so-called appeasers and interventionists; these dealing mainly with estimates of the relation of forces (within the imperialist camp on a world scale and between the latter and the world of socialism), timing and methods. We have also seen that these disagreements may provoke sharp internal struggles among the imperialists;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becoming sharper the more effective the anti-imperialist struggles of the masses of the people. But that does not make the Hoovers and Vandenbergs any less imperialist and warmongering than the Roosevelts and Willkies.

Hence, to accept the former for one moment as champions of peace is to commit a fatal error; to fail to expose their fakery and to fail to oppose them with a consistent anti-imperialist peace line, directed against the predatory course of the imperialist bourgeoisie as a class, is an equally grave mistake.

And that is the road along which the Norman Thomases are trying to pull the American people. Of course, Norman Thomas "differentiates" himself from his colleagues. But how? By remarking, *in passing*, that he is for socialism and they are not. However, being for socialism does not mean just saying so. It means, in this situation, *to expose* the class imperialist character of the course followed by the American bourgeoisie and its Government; it means calling upon the people to see the predatory nature of the war, to outline the way of struggle against it, and for a people's peace, in defiance of the imperialist bourgeoisie; it means showing up the imperialism and warmongering not only of the Roosevelts and Willkies but also of the Lindberghs, Hoovers, Landons and Fords.

But Norman Thomas, and the "isolationist"-imperialist camp do no such thing. Their entire conduct, including the slanders and incitements against the Soviet Union, is on a par with that of the most rabid imperialists. In short, the Norman Thomas Social-Democrats, as well as the Wheeler and Nye isolationists, are working for the American imperialist bourgeoisie, just as the Hillman-Green-*New Leader* Social-Democrats are serving the same bourgeoisie. A division of labor to keep the masses with the bourgeoisie, no matter what its internal divisions are.

It is from this standpoint that Philip Murray's statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Lend-Lease Bill has to be looked at. This statement raises some very pertinent questions against the bill. It points to the grave danger that some of the powers granted the President by the bill could be used to annul many (if not all) of the labor and progressive acts now on the statute books. It insists upon the protection of these acts and of the rights and standards of the masses generally. Which is in accord with the position of the C.I.O. and with the wishes of labor in all trade union organizations.

That, taken by itself, can be of service to the masses. But when it is coupled with the observation that "the American nation supports the policy of giving full aid to Britain," the service becomes questionable. First and foremost, because the catchword "full aid to Britain" has already shown itself to be nothing else but *an imperialist shield* behind which the bourgeoisie is involving this country ever deeper in the predatory war for the greater glory and power of American

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finance capital. It may be true that large masses still accept this catchword in the mistaken belief that it means fighting against fascism and for democracy; but then the duty of a sincere labor leader is to show these masses their error, instead of using the error to render aid to the warmongers.

Secondly, the C.I.O. as an organization did *not* accept this imperialist catchword. It was suspicious of it from the beginning and made it its main business to warn against war involvement and to oppose policies leading in that direction. Hence, on this point, Philip Murray failed to express the position of the C.I.O. as well as the wishes of labor generally.

True, Murray's statement declares that the American people are determined not to be dragged into the war. Absolutely correct. From which follows that leaders of the American masses have to expose the imperialist catchword of "full aid to Britain" as a shield for *precisely* dragging this country into the war. These leaders have to demonstrate that, under this shield, this country has already been made a military collaborator of British imperialism, and is being pushed ever deeper in this direction; that the Lend-Lease Bill is an instrument for promoting further this very war policy.

But instead of that, Murray virtually endorses the warmongering "full aid to Britain" catchword and expresses no definite opposition to the Lend-Lease Bill. Is that a solid anti-war position? No. It is not.

It is true, as Murray observes in his statement, that the Government is telling the people mighty little about its diplomacy and foreign negotiations. From which a demand should be formulated to disclose the secret imperialist machinations. But it does *not* follow that there is insufficient knowledge to see that the Lend-Lease Bill is a measure for deeper and faster war involvement and for sharper attacks upon the standards and rights of the people. For that—there is more than sufficient knowledge. There are facts, deeds and actions. And all of them prove conclusively that the official course is one of military alliance with British imperialism in the war against the tripartite powers. Secretary Hull said that much himself. That—and a reactionary war dictatorship at home. What other facts does Mr. Murray need?

Nor is it very enlightening to be told that:

"This does not mean that Americans will insist upon peace at any price, but it should be clear that Americans are determined to remain at peace rather than be drawn into the bloodbath of Europe."

This also is from Murray's statement. But what does it really mean? That the American people, like all peoples, want a just and lasting peace and not some violent and oppressive and temporary imperialist settlement that calls itself "peace"—this is absolutely true. But this hits not only the Lindberghs, Vandenbergs and Hoovers but also the Roosevelts and Willkies who parade with the shield of "full aid to Britain." And if the foregoing quotation meant to suggest that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

road to a just peace lies through supporting the Roosevelt-Morgan-Hillman interventionists, then this is laying the basis for accepting the Hillman position.

To signalize that danger and to exert all influence to prevent its realization is a vital task of the moment for the progressive labor movement and its allies among the working people.

WAGE MOVEMENTS AND PEACE MOVEMENTS

MAJOR movements for wage increases and other improvements in labor conditions are developing and maturing in many industries. To mention only some: steel, coal, auto, railroads, marine, electrical manufacturing plants and aircraft. March and April will see the culmination of many of these movements. There is nothing more important for the American people generally, not alone for the trade unions involved, than to insure the success of these movements. Why?

First of all because they are just. Taking wage figures from the report of the Government's Social Security Board, the resolution of the C.I.O. on wage policy (adopted by the Executive Board, January 8) shows that in 1937, "the highest wage year between 1929 and 1939," more than one-third of the workers had annual incomes of less than $500, and that about eight and one-half million of these earned less than $300. Further: more than fourteen and one-half million had an annual income of less than $700; and that nearly nineteen million, or two-thirds of the workers employed in private industry in that year, had annual wage earnings of less than $1,000. And these figures do not include the lowest paid domestic and agricultural workers.

So much for the justice of the wage movements taking place *in the face of mounting profits and a rising cost of living.*

These wage movements are taking place in the face of a determined offensive by the employers, assisted by the Government, to keep wages down as much as possible, and to stretch hours up in the same way. This offensive results not only from the inherent rapacity of capitalist exploitation but is stimulated now especially by the war policy of the American imperialist bourgeoisie. It is the policy of *making the masses pay the cost of the war and of the war preparations.* And that includes not only labor, but also the working farmers and all working people.

Keeping wages down and pushing hours up and increasing speed-up is one way of doing it to labor. A direct way. But the imperialists are figuring on other ways too. Increasing indirect taxation which squeezes all working people. Raising the cost of living. Creating a shirtage of articles of consumption, by shifting most of the industrial resources to war production, thus devaluing the worth of the people's earnings. Cutting down on relief, to farmers and workers, and decreasing social services generally. Forcing the masses "to save," to spend less for living, either by buying Government securities or in some other way, which is equivalent to curtailing the income of the masses, since

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these spend most of their meagre incomes on living. They have little to save. And all this is shaping up as an integrated imperialist program of making the masses pay for the war adventures of the exploiters.

When, therefore, the miners, steel workers, auto workers, seamen and workers in other industries are fighting for higher wages and other improvements of working conditions, they are fighting not only for themselves but for all working people. They are opposing a war policy of the exploiters which seeks to impose upon all working people new burdens to cover the cost of their war adventures. The success of these wage movements in the industries will make the toiling farmers so much stronger to resist the burdens which the war-makers are placing upon them. All working people stand to gain from the advance which labor is preparing to make.

And if, in addition to demands for improved wages and better working conditions, labor also widens its struggle against the *general* war policies of the imperialists; if demands dealing with economic standards should become more generally linked up with demands protecting civil liberties and the independence of the trade unions, with struggles and slogans, such as: "Get Out and Stay Out of the War," "No Support for Any Steps Leading to Further Involvement (Lend-Lease Bill)," "For a People's Peace," etc. If a closer and more intimate connection should be developed among these various movements and struggles of the people, then the power of the masses would be immeasurably increased, then the benefit to the people of all these struggles would be incomparably greater, then also the *success* of each of these movements would be more significant. More tangible in the immediate outcome, and more promising and significant for the longer run.

This therefore is the time of all times to render all possible support to the wage movements of the workers in the industries, to help organize the struggles of the farmers and of all working people for the protection of their economic standards and civil rights, to connect politically and ideologically all these movements with the general struggle against the imperialist war and for a people's peace, and to promote in this way the building of the united anti-imperialist people's peace front under labor's leadership.

FOR FRIENDLY RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

IT IS quite evident that ever larger numbers of the working people in the United States desire friendly relations between this country and the Soviet Union. And it is equally evident that the present policies of the American Government, far from pursuing this desirable end, are more in the nature of political maneuvers — maneuvers directed toward using the Soviet Union for imperialist objectives of the American bourgeoisie and toward creating antagonisms between the Soviet Union and Germany. Such maneu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vers can hardly be said to be contributing toward the development of really friendly relations between the two countries.

Why do ever larger numbers of the American people desire friendly relations with the Soviet Union? Because they are gaining a better understanding of the nature and policies of the socialist state, despite all efforts to the contrary by the imperialists and their reformist flunkeys. The masses are gaining the understanding that the Soviet Union, being by its very socialist nature a non-imperialist and anti-imperialist state, is pursuing a genuine policy of peace and neutrality; a policy directed toward keeping out of the imperialist war, toward maintaining peace in the regions most vitally affecting its security, towards countering and neutralizing the efforts of the imperialists to draw the Soviet Union into the war, towards helping all those peoples who are fighting for their national independence and freedom, towards maintaining and strengthening business relations with all countries similarly minded. Moreover, there is a growing admiration among wide masses, of the skill and consistency with which the Soviet Union has been able to pursue this policy successfully in the difficult and dangerous world situation.

As has already been observed, the lifting of the "moral" embargo from the Soviet Union by the American Government is undoubtedly a concession to the growing desire of the American masses for friendly relations with the Soviet Union. It is, in a sense, a tribute to the successful pursuit of the Soviet Union's peace policy.

So far so good. But what will come out of it? Does this gesture signify a real intention on the part of the American Government to develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union?

The answer to these questions must be looked for in the sphere of practical deeds. To begin with—in the sphere of business relations. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it stands for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries of like intentions. Naturally, it stands for the same thing with respect to the United States. And if the Government of the United States were standing on the same position with respect to the Soviet Union, there would undoubtedly be evidence of growing trade and increasing friendly relations. But there is still very little evidence of such developments. And the reason is that the American Government is not utilizing the opportunities offered it by the general position of the Soviet Union.

Why doesn't it? Many answers have been given by the imperialist press in recent weeks to justify the "reluctance" of the American Government to strengthen trade relations with the Soviet Union. But none of them is the true one. The true answer is that the American Government seems to be more interested in making trouble between the Soviet Union and Germany than in strengthening trade relations with the Soviet Union. The so-called argument that trade with the Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union may be of help to Germany—an assumption that has never been proved—is completely invalid from the point of view of the vital interest of the American people to develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union. It is invalid for the basic reason that the Soviet Union is helping neither one nor the other of the imperialist warring camps, that its foreign policy has proven itself a true policy of peace and neutrality, that its trade policies are governed by this foreign policy and by this alone.

Consequently, the strengthening of trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union can have, aside from the mutual economic advantages, only these political effects: it will tend to develop general friendly relations between the two countries, something the masses of our people desire very much; it will tend to neutralize the machinations of those imperialist tendencies which seek to embroil the Soviet Union in the war; it will finally tend to encourage all those who look forward to a true people's peace, free of violence and oppression, in the establishment of which the Soviet Union is bound to make a great and significant contribution.

These are the likely economic and political consequences of strengthened trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. These—and not the manufactured "danger" that thereby the war capacities of German imperialism would be increased.

But the American Government is apparently interested not so much, if at all, in these mutually advantageous benefits of strengthened Soviet-American trade relations but in something else. It apparently wants the Soviet Union to help the war of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc against German, Italian and Japanese imperialists. In other words, the American imperialists want the Soviet Government to abandon its policy of peace and neutrality, to help promote the interests of one imperialist gang as against the other. And if this is so, and to the extent to which the American Government feels free to disregard the wishes of the people for friendly relations with the Soviet Union, then and *to that extent* the "friendly" gestures of the State Department towards the Soviet Government will remain little more than political maneuvers. Only the struggle of the masses of the American people for friendship with the Soviet Union can bring about a development of friendly relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

For it is necessary to consider the contradictory character of some of the imperialist policies with respect to the Soviet Union, something to which Earl Browder has drawn renewed attention in recent weeks. These contradictions are seen most clearly in the policies of British imperialism, but they are operating to a considerable degree also in the policies of American imperialism. Of course, these imperialists would like to have "friendly" relations with the powerful Soviet Union, to use that power for their imperialist ends; but all the while, moved by the fundamental contradictions between the world of capitalism and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world of socialism, they are in mortal fear of seeing the Soviet Union gaining in strength, and are therefore continually plotting against its positions and security.

And here is how it works out. As the American Government moves into ever closer military collaboration with the Axis, with the imperialist contradictions between the United States and Japan becoming more acute, our State Department makes gestures of friendship to the Soviet Union; that being considered good diplomacy. Very well. But gestures alone, obviously, cannot do the job. There is the important question of trade relations. Why not develop them further, if friendship is desired? There are the Baltic Soviet Republics. Why not recognize them, if the intention is the development of friendly relations?

This failure of the American Government to recognize the Soviet Republics in the Baltic and their affiliation with the U.S.S.R. deserves more attention that it has thus far received by the peace movements in the United States. What is behind it? The peoples of these republics have determined their state affiliation and internal social system freely and in a most democratic way. It was a genuine expression of the self-determination of nations. Furthermore, it is generally admitted, even by many of the enemies of the Soviet Union, that the U.S.S.R. has a vital interest, from the standpoint of its security as a state, in seeking to maintain peace in the Baltic and Black Sea regions, and to keep the interventionist machinations of the imperialists out of there. This being so, what is the meaning of this "non-recognition" policy? What imperialist calculations and interventionist plans lurk behind this policy of the American Government? And how can this be reconciled with the officialy expressed desire to develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union?

But this is not all. We are told that the present official policy is to render all aid to China and to secure Soviet friendship for this policy. Very well. And we shall not at this moment undertake to emphasize the well-known fact that no one needs to worry about Soviet friendship and help for national China; that friendship is *there* all the time, even though American imperialism is still helping the Japanese invaders while making mostly *gestures* of good will to China. But taking the declarations of our State Department at their face value—that the American Government is seeking to "secure" the friendship of the Soviet Union for a policy of all aid to China—how is this to be reconciled with the continued hostility and underhand political maneuvers of the same American Government against the Soviet Union?

We have been told lately by the imperialist press that on some of these questions there are British influences at work. That is probably true. Lord Halifax, now stationed in Washington, and loyal to the Munich traditions, is undoubtedly doing his best to hamper the development of friendly relations between the United States and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S.S.R. It is also being rumored, not wholly without justification, that the same noble lord is cooking up a new scheme for British, American *and Japanese* collaboration in the Far East. Knowing British imperialist policy, that too is quite likely. But where does the *American* Government stand on these questions? It is supposed to be unwilling—so the papers report—to sacrifice the interests of American trade with the Soviet Union to British imperialist ideas. It is supposed to be trying to develop friendly relations with the Soviet Government, according to all the news from Washington. But where is the evidence? From the facts known so far, the evidence goes all the other way. How, then, can one refrain from thinking that it is all political maneuvering?

The masses of our people want genuine friendship with the Soviet Union. This must be fought for, since it can be gotten in no other way. The people's fight for friendship with the Soviet Union is a fight for a better world, for the happiness, prosperity and freedom of our own people. It is the great fight against the imperialist war and for a just and lasting peace. And in this historic fight, the strength and influence of the Soviet Union are of decisive importance. That is why the imperialists *of all camps* fear that strength and influence; that is why each gang of imperialist brigands, in its own special way, is continuously plotting against the Soviet Union.

Mankind's very future is bound up with the success of the Soviet Union's peace policy. The stronger the Soviet Union grows—and it is intensively building up its own strength—the brighter the future of humanity, the sooner will the hour strike of peace and freedom, the more certain and painless will be the achievement of the success of all peoples in their struggle for peace, security, national independence and freedom. That is why the American people are so vitally interested in a strong and ever stronger Soviet Union.

As this is being written, the Soviet Union and its friends everywhere have been celebrating the sixtieth birthday of Comrade Voroshilov, Chairman of the Council of Defense of the Soviet Union, an outstanding Leninist, a loyal disciple, friend and comrade-in-arms of Stalin. In this celebration there is profound meaning for our own people. For here stands forth the new type of leadership—Party leader, statesman, Red Army organizer —coming from the working class, living and struggling with the people and for the people, marching in the front ranks of the glorious party of Lenin and Stalin, building the future of his own people and of mankind. Because of Voroshilov and what he stands for, the outlook becomes brighter for the eventual victory of all peoples against their oppressors, exploiters and despoilers.

In the conviction of the masses of the American people that the strength of the Soviet Union is our strength, that its socialist victories and the success of its peace policies are our victories—forward in the struggle for friendly relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOSTER'S SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY

HE WAS sixty years old on February 25, and the Party with its mass of friends and supporters are joyfully celebrating the event, pouring out their heartfelt love for him and their deep appreciation of his achievements and leadership. May he continue for many more years, in good health, with us and at the head of us, teaching, guiding and organizing, in the liberating cause of the American people, for which he has already contributed so much.

It has already been said of William Z. Foster, the National Chairman of the Communist Party, that he typifies the best in the American working class. Born to the proletariat and coming from its midst, he has gone through a hard and instructive road of experience in the struggle of the masses against their exploiters, in their great efforts to rise to class consciousness and organization, in their magnificent movements to influence and leadership in the nation. Always close to the masses, teaching them and learning from them, organizing and guiding their struggles.

He always looks happiest when among the masses. And they reciprocate. They not only love him; they are also proud of him, as are his friends and collaborators in the Party. He is theirs, their Bill Foster.

The story of his achievements and leadership up to date is rich and colorful and pregnant with deep significance for every American worker. When you say Foster, you speak of the pioneer of the modern labor movement in the United States, the man who hammered out the ideas of industrial unionism, of a trade union movement infused with the principles of class struggle and with the great ideal of socialism. When you say Foster, you mean the pioneer organizer and leader of modern progressive trade unionism, the one who assembled and led the significant struggles against the rotten reformism of Gompers, laying the basis for labor's historic advances in our own days. And when you celebrate Foster's sixtieth birthday, you honor and celebrate a great organizer of the masses and of mass struggles that are milestones in the history of the American working class. To mention only the great steel strike of 1919.

And more than that. Following the profound experiences of the American working class during the first world imperialist war, enlightened and inspired by the great socialist revolution in Russia and by the triumph of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, Foster's name began to signify something new: the unity of the American labor movement with the ideals and principles of communism; it stood for the emergence and growth of the Communist Party. Through Foster, with his close friends and collaborators—Earl Browder, Jack Johnstone and others—the Party was acquiring its roots among the masses; and through the same Foster and his friends, ever larger masses were coming to recognize and accept the Party as their own.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus continuing through the years the work begun by Charles Ruthenberg, carrying forward the best revolutionary traditions of the American people and of its magnificent working class, the Communist Party was being built and a leadership crystallized, at the head of which stand today Earl Browder and William Z. Foster.

Thus it was that Foster became a great American exponent of the teachings and principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin; a mass champion of that glorious world liberating movement which is represented in the Communist International; a leader in the struggle against all varieties of reformism and Social-Democratism, against the menaces of sectarianism, against such insidious enemies of labor and of the Party as the Lovestoneites and Trotskyites.

Active in mind, young in spirit, ready for all sacrifice in the cause of communism, may he continue for many and many years our friend, our guide, our inspiration.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY HAILS WILLIAM Z. FOSTER ON HIS 60TH BIRTHDAY

THE sixtieth birthday of William Z. Foster, National Chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, is a historic event for the whole working class of our country, as it is for the entire leadership and every member of the Communist Party.

The work and struggles of Comrade Foster on behalf of the labor movement have a significance beyond the borders of our country, because they have contributed greatly to the international cause of the working class and oppressed peoples in all countries.

Comrade Foster's birthday occurs at a time when the ruling class has for the second time in our generation driven our land into a war ruinous to the interests of America's laboring people, at a time of systematic attacks upon labor's rights and organizations, at a time of vindictive onslaught upon the workers' political vanguard, the Communist Party, climaxed by the imprisonment of its General Secretary, Earl Browder.

For forty years Foster has been a loyal member and an indefatigable builder of the great movement of the working class whose destiny it is to free the human race from poverty, unemployment, oppression and war. Not a single phase of modern advancement in the organization and enlightenment of the American working class and its trade unions and political party but has received from this honest and fearless leader a distinctive contribution. To William Z. Foster, more than to any other American, the workers' movement owes thanks for the inspiration and development of the modern conceptions of trade union organization and strategy best adapted to struggle for the immediate and ultimate needs of the workers. Decades ago his work placed upon the highway of trade union progress ineradicable mile posts which the workers find valid in leading them to effective organization today.

Foster was a pioneer in the movement for independent political action of the working class, and played a part in the founding and development of the political party of the workers at the beginning of the century. Foster's incorruptible loyalty and political integrity led him inevitably to become one of the earliest and greatest defenders of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Communist International and builders of the workers' revolutionary party of socialism, the Communist Party.

In his historic role as an organizer and leader of the trade unions, William Z. Foster contributed more than any other man to the great struggles of the workers in 1919 in the campaign to organize the steel industry—the most basic struggle of the American workers in the whole of the past generation. With bold and far-seeing leadership Foster did more than any other man to place the trade unions again on the highroad to recover their ground and to advance after the orgy of blood and repression of Woodrow Wilson's imperialist war and the betrayals of the corrupt bureaucracy of Gompers. But the unique character of Comrade Foster's value to the labor movement lies in the living contribution of his work today, under the conditions in which the workers are forced to fight against the new orgy of war profits and repression in the second World War into which our country has been plunged and is now engaged.

Hand in hand with the General Secretary of our Party, Comrade Earl Browder, Foster was our teacher and pioneer in laying the groundwork of the trade union policy of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in its formative days. Foster's contributions have been inestimable in the development of the policies of the Communist Party, both in the trade union field and in connection with the struggle against war. To every worker in America William Z. Foster is a living example of the power and indispensability of the workers' revolutionary political party, not alone in the profound and ultimate liberation of the workers and the nation through socialism, but also in even the smallest everyday problems of the trade union struggle.

Comrade Foster is one of the greatest Americans and one of the indispensable leaders of the people, in that he is able to bring to the people the clear lesson of international solidarity and the knowledge that in the triumphant success of the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the socialist victory of the workers in all lands is now on the practical order of history.

Foster is a highly gifted teacher from whom the workers learn their own powers, their own invincibility, the fact that Americans can do all that can be done by any people.

We congratulate our Comrade Foster and wish him good health in the brilliant years of leadership ahead.

The National Committee urges every worker to learn from the life and activity of Foster to complete the organization of the unorganized, to conduct a powerful struggle, against the war, and to liberate Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, which is the indispensable vanguard in the struggle for an America of socialism, freedom and peace.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD CAPITALISM AND WORLD SOCIALISM

AFTER EIGHTEEN MONTHS OF WAR

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE great capitalist powers, in their brutal struggle to redivide the world to the advantage of their respective ruling classes, have been warring viciously against one another and against weaker peoples for a year and a half (and for three and a half years against China). During this period they have been ruthlessly overrunning neighboring countries, bombing cities, sinking ships, starving whole populations, destroying social institutions, and subjugating hitherto independent nations. It is very important, therefore, that we should sum up what effects all this devastation is having upon the world capitalist system and upon the international struggle for socialism.

In the June, 1940, number of *The Communist*, in an article entitled "World Socialism and the War," analyzing the world situation at the outbreak of the second imperialist war, I enunciated three general conclusions. First, that since already at the outbreak of the present war the world capitalist system was much weaker internally, consequently it was far less able to withstand the shocks of war and revolution than it had been at the inception of the World War. This greater weakness of capitalism was caused by the corroding effects of the ever-deepening general crisis of the whole capitalist system during the intervening twenty-five years. It was evidenced, among other facts, by the unparalleled economic crises of the past decade; the paralyzing growth of monopoly control throughout capitalism; the breakdown of international trade and the gold standard; the collapse of treaties and international law; the forced adoption of make-work schemes by the various governments to keep their sickly economies in operation; the plague of "little" wars; the unexampled armaments race; the destruction of bourgeois democracy and the growth of reaction and fascism in many countries; and, most of all, the loss of one-sixth of the world to capitalist control through the establishment of the U.S.S.R.

Secondly, that while the capitalist system was weaker at the beginning of this war than at the outset of the World War, the forces mak-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing for world socialism were much stronger. This factor resulted also from the deepened general crisis of capitalism. As evidences of this greater strength of the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist forces, I cited the powerful U.S.S.R. (which did not exist in 1914), the growth of the Communist International and the decline of the Second International, the increasing dissipation of capitalist illusions among the workers and other toilers all over the world, the greater strength of the national liberation movement in the various colonial and semi-colonial countries, and the broader and more explosive character of the problem of national minorities in Europe.

Thirdly, that in the present war both the above-given factors are developing at a much faster tempo than they did during the World War. That is to say, capitalism is weakening and socialism growing stronger much more quickly than was the case during the last great war, and, therefore, we can look to a swifter and broader growth of the world socialist forces as a consequence of this war than occurred in connection with the World War.

The purpose of the present article is to carry forward to date the foregoing analysis; to point out some of the major respects in which the capitalist system is being weakened by the war; to indicate the growth of the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist forces; and to show the accelerated pace, in comparison with that of World War days, at which this whole revolutionary process is proceeding.

The Weakening of World Capitalism

The outbreak of the present war signifies a great aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. Already, from the course of the war so far, it is clear that the structure of the capitalist system is now undergoing a broader, deeper and more rapid undermining than it did during the World War at a similar early period. To demonstrate this basic fact let us briefly examine some of the major aspects and results of the war:

(a) *Acutely sharpened capitalist antagonisms:* The issues involved in the present clash among the imperialist powers and against the weaker capitalist nations are more profound, urgent and insoluble than in the last war. There is the broader and more rapid spread of the conflict. During the World War while there were more nations officially involved than there are to date in this war, nevertheless, that great conflict was almost entirely a European war so far as hostilities were concerned. Very little actual fighting took place in Asia, Africa and the Western Hemisphere. In the present war, however, not only have nearly all the European nations (save the Soviet Union) become belligerents, but Asia and Africa are also major fields of battle. The U.S.A., in this war, has much earlier, more blatantly, and more effectively thrown its support to the British imperialist side. There is the further strong probability of the war also being finally carried to the Americas. Already many more millions of people are involved in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the active struggle of this war than in the World War at its height, and the war is still rapidly spreading.

Further, the stakes for which this war is being fought are greater than in the World War. The capitalist powers, pressed irresistably into the war by their insoluble internal crises, are literally fighting a life-and-death struggle. Not only are the great empires battling for world dominion, but at the same time their very existence is in jeopardy. From what has already happened to various conquered countries in Europe it is plain that the fate which threatens the vanquished in this war, whichever imperialist group wins, is more or less complete loss of national independence, de-industrialization and economic degradation to a semi-colonial status, establishment of new and worse forms of slavery for the workers and other toilers, wholesale removal of populations to less favored areas, or even their physical extermination as a people. The World War, despite its ruthless peace treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Versailles, never reached these low levels of barbarism. Consequent upon its greater stakes and the sharper antagonisms between the capitalist powers, this war is being fought with far greater ferocity and destructiveness, both physically and ideologically.

(b) *Deeper economic disruption*: The present war is also doing quicker and greater damage to capitalism than did the World War, because of the more profound economic disruption which it is bringing about. For one thing, the larger role of mechanization and the "total" character of the war are profoundly upsetting the internal economics of the various capitalist countries. A far bigger share of the national production is being devoted to war ends now than during the World War, with more rapid lowering of mass living standards. Besides this, the economies of the many conquered countries are being literally shattered by the de-industrialization policies, huge indemnities, and war devastation inflicted upon them by the victors.

World trade is also being more reduced than it was during the World War, because the blockades and counter-blockades are more effective. All Europe is now under blockade and on the verge of starvation, whereas during the World War several neutral European countries traded freely with the rest of the world. The United States is not at present trading, in its own ships, with any of the countries in the war zones, although it did so during the World War. Several Latin American countries are also plunged into deep economic crises because they are virtually cut off from their indispensable European markets. The shattered French, Dutch and Belgian empires can trade little, if at all, with their widely scattered colonies. And the Far Eastern trade of British and American imperialism is badly disrupted by the Sino-Japanese war. Besides all this, the air bombings, through the destruction of factories and the loss of work time to the workers, are greatly reducing national production. In England the falling off of munitions production due to air bombings has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been estimated as high as 50 per cent and in Germany from 20 per cent to 30 per cent.

(c) *Greater financial costs of the war:* The expenses of this war are also proportionally far greater than that of the World War. Consequently, the capitalist countries, already greatly weakened by long years of unhealthy internal economies, are traveling much faster on the road to bankruptcy. In his 1940 May Day speech Georgi Dimitroff stated that although the war was then only a few months old, its course and preparation had already cost $100,000,000,000, as against $180,000,000,000 for the whole four years of the World War. Since Dimitroff made this statement the total World War costs undoubtedly have been far exceeded by the skyrocketting expenditures.

At present Great Britain is spending 60 per cent of its national income for war purposes, and Germany about the same. Japan, in its war against China, has already squandered twelve times as much as it did in the 1904-05 war against Russia and is in a desperate condition financially. Defeated and disorganized France is compelled to pay 400,000,000 francs, about $8,000,000, a day for the German army of occupation, and *The New York Times* estimates that its total government expenses "are at least as large as the entire national income" —an obvious condition of bankruptcy. Italy, like many other European countries, is literally bankrupt. Our neighbor, Canada, is wasting 40 per cent of its national income on the war.

The United States, with the national debt limit already raised to $65,000,000,000, is spending billions of dollars at an unheard-of rate in its feverish preparations for war. Should the war be prolonged for two or three years, as it probably will be, world capitalism will be confronted at its end with a condition of monster national debts, inflation, high taxes, economic prostration, and general financial exhaustion and bankruptcy far worse than after the World War.

(d) *Unparalleled property destruction:* The World War caused a widespread property destruction in Belgium, Northern France and Eastern Russia, but these losses have already been exceeded in the present war. The *blitzkrieg* in Poland almost obliterated Warsaw and many other cities. Huge damage was also done in Norway, Belgium, Holland and Northern France during the German invasions. The 4,500,000 tons of British shipping that has been sunk far exceeds the figure at the corresponding period in the World War. Besides all this, Britain and Germany are steadily destroying each other's cities. The terrific range of the devastation caused by the bombing of many British cities was graphically illustrated by a letter from an English engineer, printed in the *New York Herald Tribune* of February 2, describing a big section of London.

"We traveled," he said, "for miles without, so far as I could see, passing a habitable house, acre after acre of collapsing or collapsed jerry-built semi-detached houses. Not a soul was to be seen."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Untold billions of property damage has already been done in the war, and the worst is yet to come. The weakening effect of all this upon capitalism is obvious.

(e) *Involvement of the people in the hostilities:* So far this war has not caused the huge casualties among soldiers incurred in the World War, a carnage that will probably come at a later stage. But the general populations, living in air-bombed cities, are suffering far greater terror and hardships in this war than in World War days. This condition is causing tremendous casualties among them from sickness and violent death. Here is war in its most barbarous form. Men, women and children indiscriminately butchered en masse. Then there are the gigantic armies of refugees, whole populations uprooted, the like of which the world has never seen before. Ex-President Hoover asserts (*The New York Times,* February 17) that the present famine in Europe is "swifter and of far greater proportions than that of the 1914-18 World War." The eventual effect of all this savagery will be to develop anti-capitalist moods among the workers much more quickly and intensely than during the World War.

(f) *Defeat of many capitalist states:* The whole system of world capitalism has been dealt a heavy blow by the military conquest of various countries in this war. Not only have such countries as Poland, Norway, Denmark and Czechoslovakia been overwhelmed, but the big empires of France, Italy, Belgium and Holland have been shattered. This has injured world capitalism in its deepest structure. An effect even more undermining has been caused by the serious weakening of the vast British Empire, a very cornerstone of the whole capitalist system. Great Britain, which, in its greed for world domination is largely responsible for this war, has already been stripped of its European allies, attacked in its homeland, is facing colonial revolt, is fighting for its very existence. Its further continuance of the war has become dependent upon support from the United States. No comparable disruption of the structure of world capitalism took place during the World War until the very last stages.

(g) *The early exhaustion of the combatant powers:* One of the most striking features of this war, in contrast with the World War, is the weaker fighting capacities of the several capitalist powers. Although they are more ferocious and relentless, they have less strength. This is basically because the capitalist system was generally stronger and healthier in the World War period than it is now. The present relative impotency, shared by all the powers on both sides of this conflict, originates in the general sickness of capitalist economics, the gigantic costs of the war; the treacherous and reactionary policies of the ruling classes, expressed by Munichism, sabotage of defense, etc.; and the lack of mass support for the war. France, like Poland, rotten and demoralized, was virtually incapable of resistance and there was no trace of its powerful struggle of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

World War times. Italy, although it has so far made only an insignificant war effort, is already staggering around like a half-knocked-out boxer. Japan, a prey to ravaging internal crisis, has bled itself nearly to exhaustion in its feeble war against Nationalist China. Germany makes a great show of strength so far, but it is safe to say that if that country is really put to the test by a hard war it and its armies will evidence the weakness that is characteristic of capitalist powers generally in this war. Great Britain, as never in its history, has experienced ignominious defeats, and its empire is visibly being broken up. American imperialism also roars like a lion bursting with strength, but it, too, with its unhealthy domestic economy, with the increasingly fascist-minded ruling class and the anti-war people, will turn out to be, if it faces a hard war, far from the lusty fighter that on the surface it now appears.

(h) *Breaking down of Social-Democracy:* One of the major phases of the general weakening of the world capitalist system during the present war is the accelerated total ideological bankruptcy of Social-Democratism all over the world, and its organizational collapse in various countries—France, Holland, Norway, Belgium, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Thus, one of the very pillars of capitalism is steadily crumbling. The suppression of the reactionary Social-Democracy is not to be confused with the driving underground of revolutionary Communist Parties which are carrying on their struggle to rally the masses against capitalism. The capitalist-minded bureaucrats controlling the big Social-Democratic Parties and trade unions throughout the capitalist world have served long and well their imperialist masters by paralyzing revolutionary understanding and activity among the world's working class and sabotaging the Peace Front. But now the capitalists, hard-pressed by their crisis, are being forced to destroy or greatly to weaken the organization of their Social-Democratic lackeys and to grasp at more direct and desperate fascist terrorist methods of subjugating the workers and their allies in the class struggle. Meanwhile, seeking to be restored to capitalist favor, the Social-Democrats, in their role as pseudo-opponents of fascism, continue their traditional efforts to paralyze all real anti-capitalist struggle by the workers. But when the masses begin to move Social-Democracy will not be restored to its former power in their ranks.

(i) *Disruption of the capitalist anti-Soviet front:* Ever since the Soviet Government was established in 1917 the capitalist powers have pursued as their basic world policy the building of a united front to destroy that Government. Only by circumventing this anti-Soviet front has the U.S.S.R. been able to survive. The capitalist anti-Soviet front has taken many forms—armed intervention in 1918-20, economic boycott for many years, and a long-continued attempt diplomatically to isolate the Soviet Union from the rest of the world. It was in this general anti-Soviet spirit that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Tories, applauded by French and American reactionaries, armed Nazi Germany in the hope that Hitler, with the active aid of Japan, Italy and Poland, and with the support of the rest of the capitalist world, would attack and destroy the Soviet Union. It is a most important fact that with the great imperialist powers at each other's throats, the capitalists' much-prized anti-Soviet front has been shattered. Busy attacking one another, the capitalist states, for the time being at least, have little opportunity jointly to attack their socialist enemy. Germany was compelled to sign a non-aggression pact with the U.S.S.R., Japan is seeking a similar treaty, the United States has reluctantly lifted its moral embargo, and even stubborn old England softens a trifle its deep-seated anti-Soviet policy. The great country of socialism is thus getting a breathing spell in which to strengthen itself, while the capitalist tigers tear one another to pieces. But the U.S.S.R. remains fully armed and keenly alert against the ever-present danger of the reconstitution of the anti-Soviet front in a most violent form, even in the course of this war.

The foregoing facts give an outline of some of the principal ways in which capitalism is being weakened in this war, and at a more rapid pace than it was during the World War. The unparalleled sharpening of the antagonisms of the great capitalist powers among themselves and against the weaker countries, the profound disruption of world capitalist economy by the war, the unbearable financial costs of the war, the wholesale property destruction, the smash-up of empires and the subjugation of hitherto independent countries, the exhaustion of the warring imperialist powers, the breakdown of the Social-Democratic safeguard of capitalism, the collapse of the united front against the Soviet Union—all these developments are related expressions of the havoc being wrought to the world capitalist system by this suicidal imperialist war.

Strengthening of the Anti-Capitalist Forces

While the world capitalist system is being weakened in its structure and fiber by the war, the world anti-capitalist forces, the rebellious peoples and the elements generally that are struggling against imperialism and heading towards socialism, are constantly increasing in strength and vigor. The following indicates the general course that these developments are taking.

(a) *The advance of the Soviet Union:* The most significant strengthening of the world anti-capitalist forces is the increasing power of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R., leader and stronghold of world socialism, has evidenced sufficiently great strength in this war to guard its borders from those voracious capitalist powers that were ravenously eager to invade them. With the masterly leader, Stalin, at its head, it has been able so far to preserve a policy of neutrality and to defeat every attempt of both sides to involve it in the imperialist war. While the capitalist powers have gone ahead butchering one another the U.S.S.R. has intelligently guard-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed the peace of its people, improved its internal economy, bettered its armed forces and strategically extended its borders. This is a tremendous achievement.

By including within its ranks the oppressed peoples of Esthonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina, Karelia, and Eastern Poland, the U.S.S.R. acquired 23,000,000 new people, raising its grand total to 193,000,000. These populations and territorial increases, together with the smashing of the Finnish Mannerheim Line, enormously strengthened the strategic position of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Red Army, according to many observers, among them the Finnish General H. Oehquist, has also been raised to a high state of efficiency. Meanwhile, during 1940 the industrial output in the U.S.S.R. jumped 11 per cent over 1939, an increase equivalent in amount to the entire industrial production of tsarist Russia in 1913. This great strengthening of the Soviet Union, at a time when the capitalist powers are so weakened and disunited, has vastly increased the specific gravity of the first socialist country as a world power.

(b) *Growth of colonial liberation movements:* In the colonial and semi-colonial countries a vast development of popular revolt is taking place that bodes ill for the capitalist system. China, with its 450,000,000 population, is the most outstanding phase. The Chinese Nationalist Government, on the basis of a united front between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party and with the help of huge supplies of munitions from the U.S.S.R., has literally fought imperialist Japan to a standstill. A great people's victory is in prospect, with the establishment of an advanced type of popular democracy in a free China, unless the British and American imperialists, who are deeply alarmed at this democratic perspective, succeed in disrupting the Chinese national united front and, by turning China into another Spain, give the victory to Japan.

In India also the forces of revolution are developing rapidly. Never has British rule over these 350,000,000 people been so precarious. The Indian National Congress is pressing its demand for national liberation, the trade union movement has been united and its convention has declared against the imperialist war. Nehru and many other popular leaders have been arrested in the campaign of individual civil disobedience and the whole country is in a rising tide of anti-British sentiment. India's vast millions are on the march to freedom

Colonial Africa is also seething with anti-imperialist foment. In Ethiopia and Libya the people are taking up arms against their fascist conquerors and they will never be content merely to shift from Italian to British slavery, as Churchill plans for them. In the Union of South Africa also long smouldering national sentiments among the Boers have flared up into bitter riots. In Latin America, too, a rebellious spirit is developing among the peoples against American and British imperialist oppression, and this is being especially provoked by the present war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Further examples of the world-wide ferment among the colonial peoples are to be seen in the growing national liberation movements in Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies. Regarding the deeply exploited Dutch East Indies Hallet Abend, in a dispatch to *The New York Times* of December 30, gave a hint of the prevailing discontent when he said:

"Today a large majority of even the Netherlands officials sent out from the Netherlands, as well as virtually all the Indies-born Netherlanders, openly declare that a semi-independent status will be their demand when the war ends."

Never in the whole history of imperialist capitalism, not even in the most critical days of the World War, has the colonial world evidenced such far-reaching revolt. This vast development menaces world imperialism, and therefore world capitalism.

(c) *Explosive conditions in the conquered European countries:* Another broad avenue of growth of forces that will eventually play havoc with imperialism and capitalism generally is the developing pressure from the many oppressed European peoples. And the pressure upon them is steadily becoming greater and more unbearable. Defeated France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Austria and Czechoslovakia, as well as the bitterly oppressed Jews and other small peoples, constitute a veritable volcano of latent rebellion. Hungary, Rumania and Spain also verge on this general category. The rising spirit of rebellion, which tends to burst into violent struggles for national independence, constitutes a serious threat to the conquering imperialist states. The continued sabotage of the Czechs, the bitter resentment of the Norwegians and the stubborn hostility of the French are plain indicators of the great anti-capitalist storm that is bound to come from these sources with a prolongation of the war. The threat hanging over the Balkan nations and the other as yet unconquered small peoples in Europe will add fuel to this general resistance of the weaker nations against the imperialist forces.

(d) *Rising mass discontent in the combatant empires.* Another basic stream of anti-capitalist development is found in the fact that the workers and other toiling masses in the warring empires are in a far greater and more rapidly increasing state of unrest than were the belligerent nations after eighteen months of the World War. This is not only because of the greater pressure of this war upon them, but also because at the outset of this war they were much more definitely opposed to the war than they were in 1914. For proof of this mass peace attitude we need but to remember the great peace referenda among the British people just before the war, the general peace spirit among the French masses, the 85 per cent of the American people who stubbornly refuse to be swayed by the present deluge of war propaganda, the patent fact that the Italian people did not want to go to war, and the often noticed lack of war enthusiasm on the part of the Japanese and German masses. This initial anti-war spirit of the world's

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers, which far exceeded that of pre-World War days, has been further intensified by the great economic burdens cast upon them by the war, the exposure of the masses to the terrors of air bombings, the repressive measures taken against the toilers by the ruling classes, and the general feeling of hopelessness among the people that either side will make a just peace in the event of victory.

The profound anti-war spirit of the peoples can readily, under the fierce pressure of war, grow into revolutionary struggle against capitalism. Many signs of the preliminary stages of this revolutionary development among the workers and the toiling masses generally are to be seen in the various combatant empires. Thus there are persistent reports of unrest in Italian cities, in Japan the masses are restive, and in Germany anti-war feeling expresses itself in a growing passivity towards the war. Writing in *The New York Times,* January 11, Anne O'Hare McCormick stated:

"Observers coming out of the Reich during the recent weeks all report the apathy of the populace. There are no cheers for the troops as they pass through the streets. There were no cheers for the victory parades after the battle of France."

In the United States, too, there is a deep discontent among the workers and other toiilng masses who are against the war, and the "sacrifices" which it demands. This is also true throughout Latin America. But the most dramatic and significant expression among the peoples of the combatant empires so far developed was the recent great People's Convention in England. The growing anti-war sentiments among the masses attest to the revolutionary danger to capitalism that will swiftly develop in the event of a serious exhaustion or outright defeat of one group or the other of the warring nations.

The foregoing facts represent the four basic paths along which the world's anti-capitalist forces are now developing—the expansion of the Soviet Union in power and world influence, the spread of the national liberation movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the growth of an explosive national independence movement among the conquered peoples and oppressed nationalities of Europe, and the development of a revolutionary anti-war, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist spirit among the workers and other toilers in the warring capitalist empires. These four great anti-capitalist world streams beat against a common enemy, the capitalist system itself, and as the war advances they are certain to converge more and more towards one great, irresistible anti-capitalist river.

Capitalist Measures Against the Crisis

The imperial rulers of the capitalist world are quite aware of the grave dangers that confront their organized robbery of the people. They see that, on the one side, capitalism is breaking down structurally and that, on the other, the anti-capitalist forces of the world are growing more powerful. Hence, while carrying on the war, the two

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rival imperialist groups are seeking to reorganize world capitalism and to check both of these developments which menace them.

(a) *The fascist "New World Order"*: The most striking of the plans to "cure" capitalism structurally is the "New World Order," proposed by the Axis powers—Germany, Japan and Italy. This fascist scheme of imperialism would divide the world into four principal sections, each controlled by a great power. That is, Germany and its group of puppet governments would take over Europe and Africa, Japan would grab all of Eastern Asia and thereabouts, the U.S.S.R. (we are asked to believe) would be allotted approximately its present territory, and the United States would have as its preserve the Western Hemisphere.

This grandiose project would, of course, not solve any of the basic contradictions that are now ripping capitalism to pieces, but, on the contrary, would greatly intensify them. The exploitation of the masses in the capitalist countries would be far greater and the class struggle would be intensified; the oppression of the colonial peoples and smaller nations would be enormously increased and their resistance to the imperialist states sharpened; the great capitalist empires, including the Axis Powers, would come into still heavier collisions with one another and their wars would grow even more widespread and devastating, and the antagonisms between the capitalist world and the socialist Soviet Union would be acutely sharpened.

Germany and Japan are busily engaged in building their "New World Order." But, illustrating the conflicts that would exist in such an organization, each one is building on the basis of world domination for itself. Both have pretty much the same reactionary plan in mind. The Nazis, for example, would have the Germans (the capitalists, of course) serve as a super, God-given international ruling class; Germany would also become the industrial metropolis of the world, the industries of all other countries being reorganized and reduced to a semi-colonial basis, and the populations of the subject countries still more deeply exploited and enslaved. The whole "New Order" would be dominated militarily by Germany, and fascist terror would reign everywhere. Japan is working along these same lines.

The peoples of Europe and Asia, naturally enough, do not take kindly to the "New Order" of the Nazi and Japanese reactionaries. In no case has any one of them joined it voluntarily. They have to be driven in by force of arms. The workers and other toilers, facing utter enslavement, bitterly oppose the fascist "New Order," and even the capitalists themselves of the conquered countries see in it at best only a mixed blessing. In France, Rumania, Hungary, etc. (as well as in England itself), the decisive sections of the bankers, industrialists, and landlords wanted fascism, but many of them balked at accepting it at Hitler's high price, which demanded that they give up their national independence and entirely

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subordinate their industries to Nazi wishes.

The attempts of the Nazis in Europe and the Japanese in Asia to set up their "New Order" have not in any degree offset the destructive effects caused by the war. On the contrary, they have increased the conflict at all points and are contributing still further to weaken the capitalist system structurally.

(b) *The Anglo-American alliance:* Great Britain and the United States, on the other side of the war line-up, are also seeking to take firmly in hand the decaying capitalist system. They are building a great imperialist Anglo-American alliance with which they seek to dominate the whole earth. They would reduce the world to their joint sway. They hope that after the war has ended victoriously for them they will be able, with their great wealth and resources, to set everything right again in the interests of the fascist-minded bankers who control both great empires. American imperialism, with characteristic greed, is arming to make Great Britain the junior partner in their world alliance. Meanwhile Great Britain and the United States, particularly the latter, are seeking to tide over with loans the difficulties of their allies or potential allies—Latin American countries, China, Greece, Turkey, etc.

Anglo-American cooperation is not able immediately to check the breakdown of the capitalist system during the war. And, as a long-run imperialist program, this alliance bears within itself the same fatal capitalist contradictions as the fascist "New Order." Anglo-American victory aims at (1) the subjugation of the colonies, the weaker capitalist nations, and the world toilers pretty much upon the Hitler plan, which is bound to engender similar resistance from these forces; (2) it would be but the prelude to new and fierce struggles between Great Britain and the United States, who are inveterate imperialist rivals for world mastery;* (3) it would result in renewed plottings and war attacks against the U.S.S.R. The Anglo-American-French victors in the World War could not heal the wounds of that war and they will be still less able to cure capitalism after the greater devastation of this war.

To sum up, therefore, the economic-political attempts of the capitalists to fix up their collapsing system are not succeeding. Neither the New Order of the Axis nor the Anglo-American collaboration is checking the war's devastation, nor do either of their schemes represent a program that can heal the diseases of capitalism when the war is over.

(c) *Demagogy and terror against the people:* In order to break up the various types of people's democratic and revolutionary movements and to make the people accept the war and its hardships, the rival imperialist camps are sugar-coating the war with radical demagogy even

* Philip LaFollette, in his February 3 speech on "The Town Meeting of the Air," gave a revealing example of the so-called friendship between Great Britain and the United States. He said: "As late as February, 1939, at Dusseldorf, Germany, the representatives of the Federation of British Industries, which is a quasi-official organization, and representatives of German industry met . . . and signed an agreement, the substance of which was that their respective governments would subsidize their respective trade in Central and South America, to drive the United States trade out."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than they did the World War. To hear the imperialists, revolution is sweeping the world and they are the leaders of it. Hitler and Mussolini cry out that their fight is a defensive struggle against the heartless capitalist plutocracy. Hitler says he is fighting for socialism, a "socialism" the measure of which may be had from his assurances to the workers that capitalist profits will not exceed 6 per cent. Dr. Ley, head of the German Labor Front, calls upon the workers to destroy "the Moloch of capitalism" and promises them automobiles, model houses, and many other concessions if they will but fight the war through to victory.

Not to be outdone by Hitler's demagogy, Churchill and Roosevelt shout that their war is one in defense of democracy, civilization and humanity. They talk vaguely of a "New World Order" of their own to come and are lavish in assuring the workers of the good times ahead if the British-American alliance wins the war. Their Social-Democratic and Liberal flunkeys hasten to expand upon these demagogic promises. A great revolution (with the consent of the capitalists) is taking place in Great Britain, they say. Dorothy Thompson, full of revolution-by-consent fervor, said in the *New York Herald Tribune* of February 7 that "Britain has become the master and flag-bearer of the European revolution."

Characteristically, the imperialists on both sides in the war supplement their radical demagogy with stern measures designed to destroy all resistance by the workers and other discontented sections of the population. As Georgi Dimitroff said in his speech last May Day, the capitalists, in order to save their collapsing system, have launched a turbid wave of reaction throughout the whole capitalist world. Hitler is continuing and increasing his iron methods of repression against the German workers, against the conquered nations, against the Jews. The British imperialists are seeking to suppress the rising Indian liberation movement by violence, and they have outlawed the *Daily Worker* in England as a blow against the spreading People's Convention movement. Democracy has been knifed in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Together with the American imperialists, the British are also attempting systematically to defeat the Chinese national struggles.

In the United States the wave of reaction is similarly in full swing, with President Roosevelt systematically pushing the country into the war against the will of the people, striding towards establishment of a military dictatorship, with the innumerable attacks now being made upon the workers' civil rights and living standards. In the Balkans and in Latin America like reactionary offensives are under way. Besides attacking the liberties of their own nations, colonies and vassal peoples, the warring imperialists, alarmed for the safety of their world system, never cease plotting against the socialist land, the U.S.S.R.; but so far, busy as they are in the war, they have not been able to do much against it, except to flood the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world afresh with an unprecedented deluge of anti-Soviet lies.

* * *

Under pressure of all these attacks, the world anti-capitalist forces have suffered considerable losses. The destruction of the national independence of various states, the break-up of the trade union movement in several countries, the outlawing of the Communist Party in a number of places, and the liquidation of bourgeois democracy and the setting up of fascism in many instances, are so many setbacks to the people's cause. But these defeats have not resulted in seriously checking the general mass movement against capitalism. While the capitalist system gradually weakens under the impact of the war, the world anti-capitalist forces are increasing in strength, both actually and relatively. The Soviet Union marches on to greater strength and prestige; the colonial liberation movement takes on wider scope and deeper intensity; the conquered peoples and oppressed nationalities in Europe become more explosively rebellious; and anti-war, anti-capitalist sentiment grows rapidly among the workers and other toilers in the warring empires.

The Roles of the Two Internationals

The opposite roles of the Communist International and the Second International in the present world situation are being dramatically illustrated: the first standing forth boldly as the indomitable fighter for world democracy and socialism and the other as a lackey defender of capitalism and imperialism. The Communist International, imbued with the Marxian understanding that the strength of capitalism is declining and that of the rebellious masses is increasing, is alert with socialist fighting spirit and its parties are thoroughly united. True to its revolutionary character, it has condemned the war as imperialist. Under its general slogan for "Peace, Bread and Freedom," it is fighting for the establishment of a just peace and is militantly supporting every phase of the anti-capitalist struggle throughout the world.

The Second International, at the opposite pole, is shattered and demoralized by the breaking down of capitalism. Its whole program of the gradual transformation of capitalism into socialism has been repudiated by the course of events. The International of Social-Democracy is disintegrating, not only organizationally but ideologically as well. It has become the barefaced international tool of the British-American imperialist war alliance. In the Axis and in the conquered countries many Social-Democratic leaders have gone over outright to the fascists (recent recruits in the Fauré and De Man groups in France and Belgium) and are busy fighting against the people's movement for freedom, while in the "democratic" countries about all that is left of their "socialism" is mouthy attempts to dress up the hypocritical promises of Churchill and Roosevelt with radical phrases. The leaders of the Second International, under slogans

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of national unity and class collaboration, are egging the peoples into the war on the side of the Anglo-American imperialists. And all over the world they are using their declining influence to beat down the rising wave of struggle for democracy and socialism.*

(a) *The Soviet Union*: The Communist Party, in its victorious struggle to build socialism in the U.S.S.R., has set a glorious example for all the oppressed millions of the earth. It has constructed the world's greatest stronghold of popular freedom and proved beyond all possibility of honest question the tremendous fact that socialism provides the solution of all the great economic and political evils that are now tormenting humanity under the moribund capitalist system. But all this is anathema to the Second International. True to its role as defender of capitalism, it hates the Soviet Union as deeply as the capitalists themselves. Like the capitalists, the Social-Democratic bureaucrats consider the Land of Socialism their main enemy, looking upon it as the negation of their whole opportunistic program. They are the ideological leaders of the capitalists' mud-slinging attacks against the U.S.S.R. and are doing all in their power to organize a general capitalist war against the first socialist republic.

(b) *The colonial liberation movements:* In the vital sphere of anti-imperialist struggle in the colonial and semi-colonial lands the Communists are everywhere to be found in the front line of battle. In China it is the Communists who are consistently and determinedly fighting to sustain and strengthen the national united front in the valiant struggle of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism; in India the Communist Party, supported by the Communists of Great Britain, fights resolutely, together with the people's mass organizations, for a free and democratic India; throughout Latin America the Communist Parties are tirelessly struggling against the triple threat of American, British and German imperialism, especially the first, which constitutes the main danger.

But the Social-Democrats, tails to the British-American imperialist kite, are everywhere the betrayers of the colonial peoples. The British Labor Party leaders are working closely with Churchill to strangle the national aspirations of the Indian people; regarding China, the British and American Social-Democrats are actively supporting every move of their respective governments to split the national united front of the Chinese people and to drive a wedge between Nationalist China and the Soviet Union; regarding Latin America, the Social-Democrats, both in the United States and in the Latin American countries, are tailing along behind Roosevelt's militant program of imperialism and are following a policy that would lead to the sub-

* Typical indications in the United States of the ideological decay of the Second International are the shameless pro-war demagogy of the Social-Democratic Federation, the brazen deductions by Norman Thomas that Nazism is moving toward socialism, and the open repudiation of socialism by such long-discredited elements as Lovestone and Corey.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jugation of Latin America by American imperialism.

(c) *The conquered European nations:* The same contradiction between the policies of the two internationals also shows itself in the struggle of the smaller and weaker European peoples to preserve and restore their independence. The historic policy put forth several years ago by the Communist International, of building popular front movements in the respective countries and of constructing an international peace front of all the democratic peoples in order to restrain the war-aggressor states, would have prevented the present war and also preserved the national independence of the smaller states. But the Second International, responding as ever to the dictates of its imperialist masters, sabotaged and eventually defeated the popular front-peace front proposals of the Communist International. Its leaders smashed the People's Front in France and outlawed the French Communist Party; they also helped their governments to strangle the Spanish Loyalist Government. They abetted the betrayal of Austria and Czechoslovakia into the hands of fascism. Everywhere they opposed the Soviet Union's proposed peace front, as they followed the capitalists' thesis that what was necessary was a war against the U.S.S.R. Thus they opened the gates for the war and for the ensuing wholesale subjugation of the smaller nations. And now, pinning their faith in Anglo-American imperialism, these same Social-Democratic leaders, both in the conquered countries and in the warring empires, are quite ready, if the occasion offers, to peddle away the national interests of the smaller peoples under a dictated Anglo-American imperialist peace.

(d) *Mass movements in the warring imperialist states*: In this phase of anti-capitalist struggle, too, the policies of the Communists and the Social-Democrats stand at opposite poles. Resolutely opposed to the imperialist war, the Communists are fighting to prevent the spread of the war, to establish a just and lasting people's peace, to defend the masses from the economic burdens of the war, to prepare the workers and other toilers for the establishment of socialism. In England the Communists are giving full support to the great People's Convention movement and its demands for a people's peace and a people's government; in Germany, Italy, and Japan, under terrible conditions of persecution, the Communists are carrying on their heroic struggle against the war and capitalism; in the United States the Communists are front-line fighters in the mass struggle to keep the country from being plunged fully into the war, to protect the workers' economic standards and to defend the people's civil liberties against the rising wave of reaction.

In flat contrast to all this, the Social-Democrats in the combatant states are busily doing the work of their capitalist masters. In Great Britain the Bevins, Morrisons and Citrines have become the recruiting sergeants of British imperialism, ideologically defending the war, slashing the living standards of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people for the profit of the employers, and stripping the workers of rights hard-won in decades of struggle; in Germany those of the Social-Democratic officials who have not gone over to Hitler, or not sunk completely in defeatism, are cultivating the lie that a victory by Anglo-American imperialism would free the German people; in the United States the special American brands of Social-Democrats, the Greens, Hillmans, Dubinskys, *et al*, are working indefatigably with the imperialistic Roosevelt Administration to bring the United States into the war as a belligerent, to make the workers pay the costs of the war, to outlaw the Communist Party and otherwise to undermine civil liberties, and to make the labor movement a mere cog in the imperialist war machine.

The Perspective for World Socialism

The first general clash between capitalism and the forces making for world socialism came at the conclusion of the World War. With the Russian proletariat in the lead, the workers of several countries in Central and Eastern Europe, outraged and made desperate by the war, flung themselves against the capitalist system and sought to establish socialism. But this great revolutionary effort was largely defeated by the Social-Democrats, who everywhere worked hand in glove with the capitalists to save the threatened capitalist system. Only in tsarist Russia, where Social-Democracy became discredited and the Bolshevik Party was strong and able to lead the masses, did the toiling masses succeed in fighting their way through to socialism.

The second basic collision between the world anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist forces and those of monopoly capitalism developed in the three years just prior to the outbreak of the present war. The central issue of this great popular movement was the preservation of world peace and the prevention of the spread of fascism. Its program of action was the building of People's Front movements in the respective countries and the establishment of a great international peace front of the democratic peoples (collective security) to restrain the fascist aggressor states. The leader of this second vast struggle for peace and democracy was the Soviet Union. Had the movement succeeded it would have strengthened democracy enormously throughout the capitalist world; it would have dealt fascism a deadly blow in all countries; it would have preserved world peace and, by weakening the dominant position of finance capital everywhere, it would have facilitated the toilers' march toward socialism. But once more reactionary Social-Democracy, in collaboration with the imperialists of the various capitalist countries, was strong enough to defeat the movement by sabotage and treachery. In England, France, the United States, Germany, Poland, Spain, and Scandinavia, the Social-Democratic leaders and the capitalists jointly attacked the People's Front and peace front movement and prevented its effective crystallization. The present war was the result.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now we are witnessing a third great crystallization of the world anti-capitalist forces. This, as we have already indicated, is taking place on the basis of a rapidly weakening capitalist system and is developing along four main channels: the growth in strength and prestige of the U.S.S.R., the expansion and intensification of the colonial and semi-colonial liberation movements, the increasing pressure of the oppressed smaller peoples of Europe for national independence, and the awakening of the workers and other toiling masses in the great capitalist empires. Once more, as the first country to have achieved socialism, the Soviet Union stands forth in the forefront of this whole vast movement of the world's oppressed millions. In it the Communist Parties are everywhere playing leading roles. Again the Second International, as we have seen, is trying to block and break up this great movement against capitalism. Social-Democracy is the principal obstacle in the way of the victorious struggle of the people. But this time, with its forces weakened and demoralized, it will find its counter-revolutionary task incomparably more difficult.

The two basic world trends signalized in this article—the structural breaking down of the capitalist system and the growing consolidation of the world anti-capitalist forces—do not imply an automatic establishment of socialism. On the contrary, before us there looms a prospect of sharpened class struggle on all fronts. The ruling capitalist class will not easily allow itself to be displaced. Talk of "revolution by consent" is just so much nonsense to deceive the masses.

Under the general slogan of "Peace, Bread and Freedom," the Communist International is vigorously supporting all four of the main currents of the great developing world movement of the people. Its slogan, "Peace to the Peoples," stresses the main issue that connects all these great streams. The fight for peace unites and consolidates all the peoples' struggles in defense of their economic standards and civil liberties, for national liberation and independence, into an increasingly mighty movement against the whole capitalist system. As capitalism, rotting with internal crises, plunges deeper and more hopelessly into war, the fight of the masses for a just and lasting peace grows ever more imperative and revolutionary.

The fight for peace has become a life-and-death issue for humanity. In all countries it is the center around which every issue revolves. The fight for peace will increasingly make the various streams of anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist movements realize the need for world unity of action, will make them turn to the Soviet Union as the world leader of all oppressed and war-wracked humanity. And the further the masses—in the colonial and semi-colonial lands, in the conquered European countries, in the great imperialist states—go on with their fight for peace the more they will be impelled to move in the general direction of establishing socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNISTS AND CHINA'S THREE PEOPLE'S PRINCIPLES*

BY MAO TSE-TUNG
General Secretary of the Communist Party of China

China's Revolution Part of the World Revolution

THE historical characteristic of China's revolution is its division into two stages, the democratic and the socialist. The first stage is not democracy in the conventional sense of the word, but a specifically Chinese, a new democracy. How has this historical characteristic come into being? A study of the historical development of China and of the world will show that this characteristic did not exist at the time of the Opium War. It came into being since the first imperialist World War of 1914-18 and the Russian Revolution of 1917. Let us examine this process.

Modern Chinese society is a combination of colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal characteristics. Hence, the Chinese revolution obviously must pass through two stages. In the first stage this colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal society is transformed into an independent democratic society. In the second stage the revolution is further developed to set up a socialist society. The Chinese revolution is still in the first stage today.

The first stage began, one may say, since the Opium War in 1840, that is, since the beginning of the change of the old feudal society into a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society. This change went on during the Taiping Rebellion, the Sino-French war, the Sino-Japanese war. It continued during the reformist movement initiated by the Manchu officials, the nationalist revolution of 1911, the May Fourth Movement, the May Thirtieth Movement, the Northern Expedition, the Agrarian Revolution, the Peiping student movement of 1936, and up to the present war of resistance.*

* This article is an excerpt from a series published early in 1940 in the Chinese journal *Liberation*. The explanatory notes are ours.—*Ed.*

* *Taiping Rebellion*: The agrarian revolt during the Manchu Dynasty, lasting from 1849 to 1865, directed against the corrupt Manchu officialdom. Led by Hung Suitsuen, the movement was a combination of mysticism and reform, based on two new ideas for China: the doctrine of the brotherhood of man and the theory of redistribution of wealth according to need.

Mass support for the movement was gained by a program which included a land policy aiming at an equal distribution of land and communal ownership of movable property. By 1853 the Taipings had taken Nanking, which they held as their capital for ten years, and even sent an expedition north to capture Peiping, the heart of Manchu power.

The power of the Taipings was finally broken when the Manchus, advised by the foreign imperialists of Shanghai, enlisted the services

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In different periods and in varying degrees the Chinese people have struggled to exterminate the imperialist and semi-feudal influences. They are fighting to establish an independent democratic society through realizing the first revolution. It may be said that the upheaval of 1911 started this revolution in the full sense of the word. In its social character this revolution is bourgeois-democratic. It is not yet the socialist revolution of the proletariat.

This bourgeois-democratic revolution has not yet been completed; for the enemy is still very strong. Dr. Sun Yat-sen said, "The revolution has not been completed as yet; the comrades should continue their endeavors to achieve it."

This democratic revolution has undergone tremendous changes since the outbreak of the imperialist war of 1914 and the establishment of socialist power over one-sixth of the earth, resulting from the Russian Revolution. Before this period, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of China was of the same kind as that of the bourgeoisie of the old world. It was part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of that old world. After 1918, China's bourgeois-democratic revolution entered the category of the new democratic revolution. It became a part of the socialist revolution of the world proletariat.

Why? Because the first imperialist World War and the first victory

---

of an American adventurer, Ward, who recruited an assorted crew of mercenaries and entered into the profitable business of capturing cities for the imperialists.

Millions of people were slaughtered and whole areas of countryside laid waste before the Taiping movement was destroyed.

Sino-French War: The War in which China lost Indo-China to France.

Sino-Japanese War: Japan's first aggression against China, in 1895, which resulted in the session of Formosa to Japan.

Nationalist Revolution of 1911: The overthrow of the Manchu Regime and the founding of the Chinese Republic.

May Fourth Movement: On May 4, 1919, the students of Peiping poured into the streets in a demonstration against the Treaty of Versailles which had turned the German "possessions" in Shantung over to the Japanese. The "May Fourth revolutionaries" surrounded the palaces of three traitorous Chinese Ministers of the old pro-Japanese Peking Government, beat them and set fire to their mansions. This movement forced the withdrawal of Chinese delegates from the Peace Conference. Simultaneously the May 4th movement kindled the flame of revolt against feudalism in all branches of intellectual life of the country, and took leadership in the struggle for the democratization and liberalization of education and literature.

May Thirtieth Movement: The May Thirtieth Movement, the Northern Expedition and the Agrarian Revolution, are all phases of the developing bourgeois-democratic revolution. Early in 1925, a Chinese worker was beaten to death in a Japanese mill in Shanghai, resulting in strike actions on the part of the workers and mass demonstrations led by students. The protest continued until May 30th of that year, the date of the Nanking Road massacre, when the British police of the International Settlement of Shanghai shot and killed a number of workers and students who had gathered in peaceful demonstration against the murder of the Chinese worker. This brutal action was the spark which set off the national revolution of 1925-27, culminating in the famous *Northern Expedition* of the armies of the Kuomintang, which marched as a revolutionary army from Canton and South China northward to Shanghai and later to Peking.

The Agrarian Revolution refers to the period from 1927 to the outbreak of the current Sino-Japanese war, when the Chinese Red Army led the peasantry in Kiangsi, Honan, Fukien and other provinces of China in their struggle for land against the landlords and moneylenders.

The Peiping Student Movement of 1936 marked the beginning of the united front struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese aggressors. In December, 1935, the students of Peiping and Tientsin, aroused by the threat of the loss of the five provinces of North China, as a result of the Japanese inspired "autonomy" movement, came out on the streets in tens of thousands demanding the termination of civil war (against the Communists) and a unification of the Chinese people in a common front of resistance to the Japanese aggressors. They also demanded civil rights for the people and the organization and arming of the masses. Student strikes and demonstrations continued all through 1936, and extended to every college campus and high school in China, developing finally into a movement with a much broader basis—the National Salvation movement—embracing men and women from all walks of life.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of socialism have changed the trends of revolutionary history throughout the world. These events carved a historical period for the whole world. When one section of the world capitalist front collapsed in a territory covering one-sixth of the globe, the corruption and decadence of capitalism in all other parts of the world were illuminated. The surviving parts of capitalism had to find support for their life in the colonies and semi-colonies.

In this period, however, a socialist nation was established. This nation has made clear that it will aid the struggle for the liberation of all colonies and semi-colonies. In the present period the proletariat in the capitalist nations are ridding themselves of the influence of the social-imperialist-democratic parties one after another, and proclaiming their support of the liberation of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. In this period, when the colonial and semi-colonial countries rise up to fight against the imperialists, that is, against the international capitalist class, their revolution is no longer part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old world. It belongs to the new revolution, the world revolution of socialism, of the proletariat.

The social character of the first stage of this colonial and semi-colonial revolution is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic. Objective conditions require that it make a fundamental sweep of all obstacles on the path of the development of capitalism. Yet this revolution is no longer led by the capitalist class alone, nor for the sole purpose of establishing capitalist societies and capitalist-monopolist nations. It is led or participated in by the proletariat with the aim of establishing a new democratic society in which all revolutionary classes rule jointly. This is the first stage. It is cut into several sub-stages necessitated by the activities of the enemy without, and conflicts among the allies within. Nevertheless, its fundamental characteristics remain unchanged and constant.

This revolution purports a radical defeat of the imperialists; therefore it is not encouraged but opposed by imperialism. It is, however, encouraged by socialism, supported by the first socialist nation and by the international socialist proletariat. "The Chinese revolution is part of the world revolution," is the correct estimate made during China's great revolutionary period, between 1925 and 1927. This slogan was raised by the Chinese Communists and accepted by the people, who took part in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle of that time. But the significance of this slogan was not sharply defined; it was only vaguely conceived. I remember Mr. Chiang Kai-shek saying in a public meeting at Swatow in 1925, when his troops arrived there during the East River Expedition against Chin Chuing-ming, that "the Chinese revolution is part of the world revolution." But the era of the old world capitalist revolution has passed away. We are now in the era of a new world revolution, the socialist world revolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hence China's "part" is no longer a sector of the old, but a part of the new, socialist revolution. This is a tremendous change, incomparable to any other in the history of China or the world.

The Chinese Communists were enabled to formulate this correct theory on the basis of Stalin's teachings concerning the Russian Revolution. Stalin said:

"The great international significance of the October Revolution chiefly consists in the fact that:

"(1) It has widened the scope of the national question and converted it from the particular question of combating national oppression into the general question of emancipating the oppressed nations, colonies and semi-colonies from imperialism;

"(2) It has opened up vast possibilities and revealed the proper way of achieving emancipation, and thereby greatly helped the cause of emancipation of the oppressed nations of the West and the East, having drawn them into the common channel of the victorious struggle against imperialism;

"(3) *It has thereby erected a bridge between the socialist West and the enslaved East,* having created a new line of revolutions *against* world imperialism, extending from the proletarians of the West, through the Russian revolution, to the oppressed nations of the East." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question,* p. 76, International Publishers, New York.)

Stalin has written considerably on the theory of the revolution of colonies and semi-colonies as part of the proletarian socialist revolution. The best and clearest article is one dealing with the controversy among the Yugoslav Communists. In this article, written in 1925, Stalin declared:

"Comrade Semich refers to a passage in Stalin's pamphlet, *Marxism and the National Question,* written at the end of 1912. It is stated there that 'the national struggle . . . is a struggle of the bourgeois classes among themselves.' By this he is evidently trying to hint that his own formula defining the social meaning of the national movement in present historical conditions is correct. But Stalin's pamphlet was written before the imperialist war, at a time when the national question in the eyes of Marxists had not yet assumed world significance, and when the basic demand of the Marxists, the right to self-determination, was judged to be not a part of the proletarian revolution, but a part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It would be absurd to ignore the fact that the international situation has radically changed since that time, that the war on the one hand and the October Revolution in Russia on the other have converted the national question from a part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a part of the proletarian-socialist revolution.

"As early as October, 1916, Lenin in his article, 'The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up,' said that the fundamental point of the national question, the right to self-determination, had ceased to form part of the general democratic movement and that it had become converted into a component part of the general proletarian socialist revolution. I will not mention later works of Lenin and of other representatives

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Russian Communism on the national question. In view of all this, what interpretation can be placed on Comrade Semich's reference to a certain passage in a pamphlet by Stalin written in the period of the *bourgeois*-democratic revolution in Russia, now that, as a result of the new historical situation, we have entered a new era, the era of the world *proletarian* revolution? The only interpretation that can be placed on it is that Comrade Semich is quoting without reference to space and time and without reference to the actual historical situation, and that he is thereby violating the most elementary demands of dialectics and failing to take account of the fact that what is correct in one historical situation may prove to be incorrect in another historical situation." (*Ibid.*, pp. 225-26.)

Here we see pointed out two kinds of world revolution, one belonging to the category of bourgeois world revolution, now out of date. Its time was ended before the outbreak of the first imperialist World War, before the Russian Revolution. After these two events, the second revolution, the proletarian socialist world revolution, began. In this revolution the proletariat of the capitalist countries is the chief force, and the oppressed colonial and semi-colonial nations are their allies. No matter to what classes or political parties the people who take part in the revolution of oppressed nations belong, and regardless of whether they do or do not understand this theory, their revolution is of necessity a part of the world revolution of the proletariat, if only they oppose imperialism. This makes them allies of the world revolution of the proletariat, of socialism.

Today the significance of the Chinese revolution is greatly enhanced. We are in a period when, owing to the ever-increasing political and economic crisis of capitalism, the second imperialist war proceeds day by day to involve the whole world. It is a time when the U.S.S.R. has passed from socialism to the intermediary period towards communism. The Soviet Union has developed the capacity to lead and to aid the world proletariat, and the peoples of the oppressed nations to oppose the imperialist war and to defeat imperialist reaction. It is a period when the proletarian classes of all the capitalist countries are preparing to defeat capitalism and to build socialism. It is a period when the Chinese Communists and the Chinese proletariat, the peasantry, the intellectuals and the petty bourgeoisie, led by the Chinese Communist Party, have become a great independent political force. In such a period, should we not highly evaluate the world significance of the Chinese revolution? We should. The Chinese revolution is a great part of the world revolution.

We have already seen that this first stage of the Chinese revolution is divided into several minor stages. Its social character is that of the new type bourgeois-democratic revolution, but not yet that of the newest type, the proletarian, socialist revolution. This is, we might say, the first station of the first stage. It cannot build up a capi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talist-monopolist society in China. This first stage will end with the establishment of a democratic society, governed by the joint power of all revolutionary classes.

Then will come the second stage. It will begin with endeavors to build a socialist society. This is the fundamental characteristic of the present Chinese revolution. This is the revolutionary process which began with the May Fourth Movement and proceeded during the last two decades. This is the living, concrete content of the modern Chinese Revolution.

The Politics of the New Democracy

How is this new concrete characteristic expressed in the internal political and economic relations within China? In the following passages I want to describe these conditions.

The May Fourth Movement of 1919 arose after the first imperialist World War and the Russian Revolution. The leaders of the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution were the petty bourgeoisie and capitalists, and their intellectuals. Up to that time the Chinese proletariat was not yet an awakened, independent class force, but participated in the revolution simply as followers of the petty-bourgeoisie, as it did also during the nationalist revolution of 1911. After the May Fourth Movement, the leaders of the bourgeois-democratic revolution were not alone those of the capitalist class, but also of the proletariat. By this time, because of its numerical growth and under the influence of the Russian Revolution, the proletariat had become a conscious political force. The Communist Party of China had been formed. It raised the slogan of fighting against the imperialists. It formulated a program for a thoroughgoing democratic revolution on the part of the Chinese capitalist class. The agrarian revolution was carried through by the Chinese Communist Party practically alone.

The Chinese capitalist class exists in a colony or semi-colony. As such, it is oppressed by imperialism. Hence, it retains to a certain degree a revolutionary character, in that it opposes imperialist invasion. This revolutionary character is also expressed in resistance to the bureaucratic government of native warlords, as evidenced during the nationalist revolution of 1911 and the Northern Expedition of 1926, that is, before the era of monopoly capitalism. During those periods the capitalists could unite with the proletariat and petty-bourgeoisie to fight the common enemy. Here is illustrated the difference between the capitalist class of China and that of the tsarist empire of Russia. The tsarist empire was an aggressive, militarist, feudal imperialism, hence its capitalist class had no revolutionary qualities. The duty of the Russian proletariat was to oppose this capitalist class, not to unite with it. But China is a colony or a semi-colony. That is why during certain periods the Chinese capitalist class is itself revolutionary in character. Here, since the capitalist class still retains revolutionary traits, the proletariat is en-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abled to build a united front to fight against imperialism, and against bureaucratic warlordism.

At the same time, since the colonial and semi-colonial capitalist class and its government are extraordinarily weak economically and politically, it contains yet another trait, that is, the tendency to compromise with the enemy of the revolution. The Chinese capitalist class, especially the big magnates, does not desire a definite split with imperialism, and since it also has close connections with agrarian exploitation it does not wish to and cannot thoroughly overthrow imperialism. Still less can it thoroughly overthrow feudal influences.

Thus, the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution has two fundamental problems, two fundamental tasks, which the Chinese capitalist class cannot solve or accomplish. In the period between 1927 and 1938 we have seen the Chinese capitalists fly to the bosom of imperialism and ally themselves closely with the feudal influences. They deserted both their own revolutionary program and the revolutionary people. During today's war of resistance we have seen one section of the magnates, represented by Wang Ching-wei, surrender to the enemy. This illustrates the new betrayal of the big capitalists. This is the essence of the difference between the Chinese capitalist class and that of the Western world, particularly the French capitalist class.

In the West, especially in France, the capitalist class was more thoroughgoing and radical in its revolution. In China this characteristic of thoroughness of the capitalist class is lacking. The Chinese capitalist class has revolutionary traits on the one hand, and qualities of compromise on the other. This we may call its dualism. This duality, however, is also to be found in the history of the Western capitalist classes. Faced by the enemy, they united with the peasants and workers to fight the common foe; when the peasants and workers became awakened, then the capitalists joined their former enemy to fight against this new force. This may be generally observed among all the capitalist classes of the world; but the Chinese capitalist class has even more defects, as already indicated.

It is obvious that they who can lead the people of China toward the overthrow of imperialism and feudalism will have the confidence of the people. Both feudalism and imperialism, especially Japanese imperialism, are the deadly enemies of the people. Whoever can lead the people to drive out Japanese imperialism and institute democratic politics will be the savior of the people. If the Chinese capitalists could undertake this responsibility, they would be universally admired. Otherwise this responsibility must be assumed by the proletariat.

It goes without saying that the proletariat, the peasants, the intellectuals and the petty-bourgeoisie are the basic forces which control the destiny of the nation. These classes have been awakened or are awakening in China today. They will decide fundamentally the construction of the country. They will

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establish the regime of the Chinese republic.

This type of republic to be established at the moment should be one controlled and participated in by a united front of all political parties. This is the republic of the new democracy, the republic of the new *San Min Chu I*,* of the genuine revolutionary Three People's Principles. This new democratic republic is different from the Western capitalist republics, controlled by the old capitalist class, the kind of republic which is now out of date.

But, on the other hand, the new type of Chinese republic is also different from that of the socialist U.S.S.R., in which the proletariat is the ruler. The latter is the newest form of republic, now in existence and blooming in the Soviet Union, and to be established in many other lands. Undoubtedly it is destined to be the ruling political form of all advanced capitalist countries now existing. But in certain periods this sort of republic would not be suited to the colonies or semi-colonies. For such transition periods, an intermediary form of state is necessary.

The various forms of states throughout the world can be grouped according to their social characters, as follows: (1) the republic ruled exclusively by the capitalist class; (2) the republic ruled exclusively by the proletariat; (3) the republic ruled by a united front of several revolutionary classes.

The first type describes the old-fashioned democratic nations. Today, since the outbreak of the second imperialist war, all capitalist countries have renounced their so-called democracy. All political forms of this democracy have been converted or are in the process of being converted into capitalist-military dictatorships. Those nations where landlords and capitalists are united to rule the country belong to this category.

The second form of state is exemplified by the Soviet Union. The factors are developing for its establishment in all capitalist countries, and it will certainly be adopted throughout the world eventually.

The third form of state is to be found in colonies and semi-colonies. The differences among them arise from minor characteristics of the various native conditions; but the general principle remains the same. Where colonies and semi-colonies enter upon revolution, their fundamental political make-up will be the same, that is, each will be a republic of new democracy, governed by a united front of various classes formed to fight against imperialism.

In China this type of democracy takes the form of the anti-Japanese national united front. It stands against Japanese imperialism and is at the same time a united front of several revolutionary classes. Yet, although the war of resistance has been carried on for a long time, the work of democratization has not been fundamentally done. Utilizing this basic weak point, the Japanese imperialists have managed to make considerable advances. The outlook

* *San Min Chu I*: The three People's Principles enunciated by Dr. Sun Yat-sen: National Independence, Democracy, and People's Livelihood.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the nation will become ominous unless timely reformation is made. It is to be hoped that the recently begun constitution movement may avert the danger.

The "form of state" as the term is used here, has been a problem since the late years of the Manchu dynasty. Several decades have elapsed, yet no adequate solution of this problem has been found. The essence of the problem, in fact, is the position of the various social classes within the nation. The capitalist class has heretofore concealed the position of these classes. The capitalist class has used the term "people" to establish its dictatorship over the nation. Such concealment does not promote the progress of the revolution. We should understand clearly that the term "people" has meaning only when anti-revolutionary elements and traitors are excluded from it. The political system should be administered by the revolutionaries and the revolutionary classes, while all counter-revolutionary traitors are excluded. This is the kind of state we need today.

"The system of so-called democracy in various countries is usually selfishly monopolized by the capitalist class. It has become a means to oppress the people. The principle of democracy upheld by the Kuomintang is to be applied to every citizen and not to a minority of the people."

This is the solemn declaration made by the first representative meeting of the Kuomintang held in 1924. During the sixteen years since that time, the Kuomintang itself repudiated this declaration and thus brought the nation into its critical position of today. This great mistake of the Kuomintang we hope can be corrected in the course of the war of resistance.

The term "political system" denotes a form of political structure. It describes the forms in which definite social classes organize their own political organs to fight the enemy and to protect themselves. Inadequate forms of such organs of political power cannot represent the state. China today may adopt a form of government through elections by the National People's Congress, the Provincial People's Congress, the County People's Congress, the City People's Congress, or the Village People's Congress. But it is necessary to practice genuine universal suffrage without discrimination as to sex, belief, property status or education. Only such an election system will meet the needs of the various classes and their position in the nation. Only such a system enables the people to express their ideas and to direct the revolutionary struggle. Only such a system reflects the spirit of the new democracy. This is what may be called the system of democratic centralization. Only a democratically centralized government can fully express the people's wishes and ideas. Only when it does this can it have the power to fight against a ferocious enemy. Only in this way can the democratic spirit, which cannot belong to a minority of the people, be expressed in the organization of the Government and the armies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Without a genuine democratic system, this goal cannot be achieved. Without it, there cannot be co-ordination of the political system and the form of the state. Such a state is the expression of the united front of all revolutionary classes. Such a political system is a centralization of democracy. This is what we mean by "new democratic politics." This is what we mean by a republic of the new democracy. It is a republic of the anti-Japanese united front, a republic of the three great policies and the new Three People's Principles. Today, although we hear the term "Republic of China," the actuality is just the opposite. To convert the term into reality is precisely the task we must accomplish. This is the correct direction for our "national reconstruction" work today.

The Economics of the New Democracy

The republic to be established in China, as described above, must have the new democracy politically and economically. The large banks, industries, and enterprises should be transferred to the state. Enterprises of a monopoly character and too big to be operated by private owners, such as banks, railways and aviation, whether owned by Chinese or foreigners, should be operated by the state, so that private capitalists will be prevented from manipulating the livelihood of the people for speculative purposes. This is the essential point for the control of capital. Yet this method does not propose to confiscate private capitalist properties or to forbid the development of capitalist production. This is necessary because Chinese economy is still very backward. In the future, some measures will be necessary to confiscate the holdings of large landowners. These will have to be distributed among the landless peasants, so as to put into practice Dr. Sun's slogan, "Those who till the land shall have the land." Thus we will sweep away the feudal relations now existing in the villages.

This does not mean to establish a socialist agricultural economy; for, even though the land is given to the poor peasants as their private property, rich peasant economy is also to be permitted to exist in the villages. Dr. Sun proposed "equal distribution of land." What is meant by this policy is that those who till the land shall have the land. Chinese economics marches ahead to the goal of "control of capital" and "equal distribution of land." It will not be a private economy. The minority of capitalists and landlords will not be permitted to "manipulate the people's livelihood." This society will not be a capitalist one, such as exists in the West, nor a semi-feudal one. Those who oppose this direction of development are doomed to fail.

Rejecting Bourgeois Dictatorship

This republic of new democratic politics and economy is supported by more than 90 per cent of the people of China. "That which is in accordance with nature, with humanity, with the current of the world, with the needs of the people, is bound to be successful," said

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Sun. There is no alternative. We cannot follow the path of a capitalist society with a capitalist dictatorship. True, the European capitalist class has traveled this path, but international and domestic circumstances do not permit China to do so.

Viewed internationally, this path is impossible for China. The fundamental characteristic of the international situation is the fact that the basic struggle is that between capitalism and socialism. In this struggle the superiority of socialism and the inferiority of capitalism are being demonstrated. Another factor is the condition that international capitalism does not permit China to develop as a capitalist state. Imperialism invades China, opposes China's independence and the development of Chinese capitalism. Imperialism has caused the failure of Chinese capitalism in modern history. Today the strong Japanese imperialism has invaded China in an attempt to convert it into a colony pure and simple. It is the Japanese who are developing their own capitalism in China, not the Chinese who are developing a native capitalism. It is the Japanese capitalist class which exercises a dictatorship in China, not the Chinese capitalist class.

It is true that imperialism today has reached its last stage and is near death. "Imperialism is moribund capitalism." Sensing its approaching death, it tries to survive at the expense of the colonies. Hence, it does not permit the growth of a native capitalist society with a native capitalist dictatorship in any colony or semi-colony. Imperialism is thus our common enemy.

Neither will socialism leave room for the existence of a capitalist class. China cannot isolate herself from the help of the socialist nation and the international proletariat. That is to say, China cannot separate herself from the Soviet Union, and the victories of the proletariat over the capitalists—in Japan, England, the United States, France, Germany and Italy. Their victories will aid us. The victory of China will follow revolutionary victory in one or two of the above-mentioned capitalist nations. It is beyond doubt that our victory will be secured with the forces of their victory. Continued help from the Soviet Union, in particular, is a prerequisite for the final victory of our war of resistance. Our revolution will fail if Russia's help is rejected. We will see this clearly if we keep alive the lessons of the anti-Soviet campaigns after 1927.

The world today is in a period of war and revolution. In such a period, when it is clear that capitalism must perish and socialism prosper, it would be fantastic for China to dream of establishing a capitalist society with a capitalist dictatorship after the victory over imperialism and feudalism has been won. Some people have drawn analogies between China and Turkey. After the first imperialist war, Turkish capitalism defeated the Greek invasion, but the forces of the proletariat were still weak. Favored by these special circumstances, a small-scale capitalist dictatorship was established by Kemal. To people

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who expect the same development in China we say, there will never again be a Turkey after the second World War and the accomplishment of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Certainly, there will not be a "Turkey" comprising 450,000,000 people in our China. Our own special conditions are that the Chinese capitalists are distinguished by their quality of compromise, and the Chinese proletariat by thoroughness and determination. Thus, the course of events in Turkey will not so easily be duplicated in China.

Is it not true that after the failure of the great revolution of 1927 the Chinese capitalists sang high songs of Kemalism, but where is China's Kemalism? Where is the Chinese capitalist dictatorship and capitalist society? And let us not forget that Kemalist Turkey has finally fled to the bosom of British and French imperialism and constituted itself a part of the reactionary imperialist world. Among the international circumstances of the '40s and '50s of this twentieth century, all leaders and great men of the colonies and semi-colonies must take their stand either on the side of the imperialist front and thus become part of world reaction, or they must join the front of anti-imperialism and become part of the world revolution. There is no other alternative.

From the point of view of the domestic situation, the Chinese capitalist class should have learned the necessary lessons. On the eve of the victory of the revolution, secured by the forces of the proletariat, the peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie in 1927, the Chinese capitalist class repudiated the masses of the people and proceeded to enjoy the fruits of the revolution. Then this class made tremendous efforts to carry through a ten-year "anti-Communist" campaign.

But what was the result? Now, when a ferocious enemy has penetrated the country and the war of resistance has proceeded for more than two years, do they believe it possible to copy the old routine of Western capitalism? The ten-year anti-Communist campaign did not produce a capitalist society. Will these people try once more? It is true that the ten-year campaign produced a one-party dictatorship, but this is a semi-feudal dictatorship, characteristic of a semi-colony. The first four years of the campaign (1927 to the Mukden Incident in 1931) only produced a "Manchukuo," and the following six years of the campaign, that is, up to 1937, only invited Japanese imperialism to penetrate the interior of China.

If another campaign should be launched now, it would be a new style campaign, more or less different from the old one. Indeed, has not such a campaign been audaciously undertaken by some quick-footed men? I refer to Mr. Wang Ching-wei. He is a world-famous new type of anti-Communist "hero." Anyone who approves his principles can enter his band. But then how can they sing so melodiously of capitalist monopoly, a capitalist society, Kemalism, a modern state,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a one-party dictatorship, one principle, and so on and so on? Of course, there are some who do not join Wang Ching-wei's band, yet dream that after our victory in the war they will repudiate us, the people who fought the Japanese, and enjoy the fruits of the victory. Then, they hope, they will establish "a long-time one-party dictatorship." Is this not a fantastic dream?

Who are those who fight the Japanese? Isolated from the workers, the peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie, we cannot move a step forward. Whoever dares to repudiate them, he will be crushed. Is this not a matter of common sense? The stubborn section of the Chinese capitalist class (that is, the stubborn elements) apparently have not learned anything during the last two decades. They are still shouting slogans of "controlling Communists," of "exterminating Communists," of "anti-Communism." Have they not formulated a "measure to deal with the problem of alien parties," a "measure to control the activities of alien parties," and "practical measures to deal with alien parties"? If they proceed with these "measures" and "dealings" I wonder what will be the fate of the nation?

We sincerely advise these gentlemen to have a look at the situation both abroad and in our country. We advise them not to repeat the old mistakes; for, if they do, in the end the nation will be ruined and they will find themselves in subjugation to foreign imperialism. This stubborn fraction of the Chinese capitalist class will find the situation very awkward if they adhere to their old conceptions. Their future will be entirely gloomy. That is why we hope that the anti-Japanese united front will be strengthened and fortified. Conditions affect not only a single party, but all of the people. The best thing for all is to cooperate so that our anti-Japanese campaign may be victorious.

Refuting the Stubborn Elements

Some stubborn elements of the capitalist class stand up and say, "Now that you Communists have said that the social system of socialism belongs to a later stage, and now that you claim you are 'struggling for a thorough realization of *San Min Chu I*' which you consider is what China needs today, then you must store away your communism for the time being." This sort of criticism, which they entitle "One Principle," becomes simply desperate, illogical shouting. It expresses the inflexibility of the bourgeoisie. For the sake of politeness, we may say that these people lack common sense.

Communism is a complete ideological system, and at the same time a new social system. As such it differs from any other ideological and social system. It teaches the most progressive, rational thoughts evolved since the beginning of human history. The feudal ideological and social systems are now museum pieces. And in the Soviet Union, some parts of the capitalist ideological and social system have indeed been stored in museums. The other parts are now like a "setting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sun, sinking rapidly and on the verge of disappearing." Thus these parts, too, have reached the doors of the museum. But the Communist ideological and social system is growing with vigor, force and strength, thundering over the world in its full prime.

In China the people's knowledge has been much advanced since the introduction of scientific Communism, and therefore the character of China's revolution has also changed. Without the guidance of Communism, China's democratic revolution could not succeed, not to speak of the later stage of the revolution. This is why the stubborn elements shout demands for the "storing away" of this doctrine. In fact, it must not be "stored away." For once it is stored away, China will be finished. Communism is needed for the salvation of the world, as it is for China.

Those who think, study and understand will see that the Communist Party presents the best program for the present as well as for the future. For today, the program is the new democracy. For the future, it is socialism. These are the two parts of an organic whole. Since the immediate program of the Communist Party of China accords with the fundamental political principles of *San Min Chu I*, it is fantastic to shout of "storing away" Communism. It is because the political principles of *San Min Chu I* conform with the fundamental points of their immediate program that the Communists recognize *San Min Chu I* as the political foundation of the anti-Japanese united front. That is why we say, "*San Min Chu I* is what China needs today, and our Party is willing to struggle for its thorough fulfilment." Without this there is no possibility for advance. This represents the united front of Communism and *San Min Chu I* in the stage of democratic revolution. When Dr. Sun said, "Communism is the good friend of *San Min Chu I*," he meant exactly this united front.

In order to avoid misunderstanding and to enlighten the backward elements, it is necessary to point out clearly the agreements and the differences between *San Min Chu I* and Communism.

Let us take first the things they have in common. There is the fundamental program on the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution, on nationalism, the principle of democracy and people's livelihood of *San Min Chu I*, as reinterpreted by Dr. Sun in 1924. These political principles are fundamentally in accord with the program of the Communists for the stage of China's democratic revolution. This similarity has made possible the united front of the two parties which exists today.

Now, as to the differences. There are differences in the programs covering the stage of the democratic revolution. The Communist program for a complete democratic revolution calls for the eight-hour work day in industry, equal land distribution in agriculture. *San Min Chu I* contains no such demands. If *San Min Chu I* is not supplemented in this respect, in theory and in practice, then the programs of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two parties for democracy are fundamentally different. Secondly, each party has a different outlook as to the two stages of the revolution. The Communists believe there is a stage of democratic revolution, and one of socialist revolution, that is, a second stage, for the realization of the social system of communism. *San Min Chu I* deals only with the stage of democratic revolution and says nothing of the stage of the socialist revolution. Thirdly, the world outlook of each party is different. The world outlook of communism is dialectical and historical materialism, while that of *San Min Chu I* is the historical interpretation of the people's livelihood.* Fourthly, the Communists call for a combination of practice and theory to assure the thoroughness of the revolution. *San Min Chu I* does not do this. The followers of *San Min Chu I*, except for some honest, loyal, truth-loving revolutionaries, contradict their theories by their actions, that is, they do not possess revolutionary thoroughness.

We have tried to explain the differences between the two parties. Those who would ignore these distinctions and see only the views they have in common would be making a mistake. Once this is grasped, one can easily understand why the stubborn elements of the capitalist class demand the "storing away" of Communism.

From the Old to the New San Min Chu I

The stubborn elements of the capitalist class do not understand the evolution of history. Their common sense is very low, almost below the zero point. They understand neither the distinctions between Communism and *San Min Chu I*, nor those between the new *San Min Chu I* and the old. We Communists recognize *San Min Chu I* as the political foundation of the anti-Japanese national united front. We recognize *San Min Chu I* as what China needs today. That is why we are struggling for its thorough realization, and why we recognize that the political principle of the immediate program of the Communists is fundamentally in accord with that of *San Min Chu I*.

But the *San Min Chu I* referred to here is the one reinterpreted by Dr. Sun in the Manifesto of the First Representative Congress of the Kuomintang. I would like to advise our stubborn gentlemen to examine this manifesto at their leisure, even if they have to take time from their precious anti-Communist work to do so. In this manifesto Dr. Sun speaks of "the genuine interpretation of the *San Min Chu I* of the Kuomintang." From this we know that any interpretation of *San Min Chu I* except as referred to here is simply a forgery. The interpretation given in the manifesto issued by the First Congress of the Kuomintang is genuine, all others are counterfeit.

This manifesto distinguishes between the two historical periods of *San Min Chu I*. Before this time, *San Min Chu I* belonged to the old category. It was the *San Min Chu I* of the revolution of old-fashioned

* A principle leading to a program for democratic economic reforms, limited within the category of capitalism.—*Ed.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democracy, the old *San Min Chu I*. The *San Min Chu I* adopted at the Congress belongs to a new category. It is the *San Min Chu I* of the new democracy, a new *San Min Chu I*. This is the revolutionary *San Min Chu I* of the new period. This new, genuine *San Min Chu I* lays down three great policies—alliance with the U.S.S.R.; alliance with the Communist Party; alliance with the peasants and workers. Any interpretation which omits any of these three policies is a false one.

First, the revolutionary, new and genuine *San Min Chu I* lays down the policy of an alliance with the Soviet Union. It is quite clear today that the only alternative to an alliance with imperialist nations is an alliance with the country of socialism, with the Soviet Union. History since 1927 proves this to be the case. During the first two years of the war of resistance, we were still able to utilize the conflicts between Great Britain and the United States on the one side, and Japan on the other. But since the outbreak of the second imperialist war, although these contradictions still exist, they have certainly been reduced.* If we do not understand the contradictions, Great Britain and the United States will ask China to participate in an anti-Soviet crusade. If China does this, she will have to align herself on the reactionary front together with our nation's enemy. Then what remains of our national independence will vanish.

Should the struggle between the Soviet Union and British-American imperialism become acute, China will have to take a stand on one side or the other. This is unavoidable. It is impossible to be neutral. When the whole world is lined up on these two fronts, the term "neutrality" becomes pap for babies. Besides, there is the inescapable fact that China is fighting against an imperialist power which has penetrated into its territory, and that our final victory is impossible without the aid of the Soviet Union. If we break with the Soviet Union and ally ourselves with the imperialists, we would be admitting that *San Min Chu I* has become reactionary and must give up the adjective "revolutionary."

For there is no "neutral" *San Min Chu I*. It must be either revolutionary or reactionary. If the policy of *San Min Chu I* means, as Wang Ching-wei said many years ago, "to struggle between two attacks," then it is a quixotic, impractical *San Min Chu I*. But our Mr. Wang, the inventor, has given up and "stored away" even this kind of *San Min Chu I*. He has changed sides and adopted a *San Min Chu I* of alliance with imperialism. If there is a distinction between Eastern imperialism and Western imperialism, then he allies himself with the Eastern brand. But we do not conceive an alliance with Western imperialism and a storming attack against Eastern as a counter-measure. This would indeed be a quixotic, "revolutionary"

* The policies launched by Britain and the United States with regard to the Far East have as their basis an identity of design on the part of these Powers and Japan to subjugate China for their respective imperialist purposes. —*Ed.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masterpiece, and what a pity! Western imperialism is preparing to launch an anti-Soviet, anti-Communist campaign. If you make an alliance with them, then they ask you to turn to the north and attack. This is the finish of the quixotic "revolution." So we see that the revolutionary, the new, the genuine *San Min Chu I* is required by objective conditions to be expressed in an alliance with the Soviet Union and not an alliance with imperialism.

Secondly, the revolutionary, the new, the genuine *San Min Chu I* must be the ally of Communism, otherwise it becomes the ally of anti-Communist imperialism. Anti-Communism is the policy of Japanese imperialism and it is the policy of Wang Ching-wei. Of course, under any conditions they would like to have you join their "Anti-Communist and Company." But in that case, will you not have the character of being a traitor? If we do not ally ourselves with the Japanese but with other imperialist nations, it is still very queer, because no matter whose leadership you follow, once you take action against the Communists, you are a traitor, for then you can no longer fight against the Japanese. It is childish to believe that it is possible "to fight Communism independently."

How can a colonial or semi-colonial people carry through an anti-revolutionary program without the help of imperialism? In the past, some leaders carried on a ten-year campaign against the Communists in which they mobilized the forces of imperialism of the whole world. Even then they did not succeed, so what can they do today independently? I used to hear of people saying, "It is good to oppose Communism, but this cannot achieve results." This idea is half wrong. What "good" can opposing Communism achieve? But it is half right. To oppose Communism really cannot "succeed." The basic reason for this is to be found, not so much in Communism, as in the people themselves. Since the people approve of Communism and not the opposing of it, they have no tolerance for anti-Communist drives.

Now, when our national enemy has forced his way into our territory, the people would finish off your life if you opposed the Communists. Those who intend to fight Communism will be crushed. If one has no liking for being crushed, it is advisable not to oppose Communism. This sincere advice we offer to all anti-Communist leaders. I think it is crystal clear that *San Min Chu I* must have an alliance with the Communists, otherwise it will perish. It is a question of the very existence of *San Min Chu I*. Allied with the Communists, *San Min Chu I* will live. It must die as soon as it changes this.

Thirdly, the revolutionary, the new, the genuine *San Min Chu I* must be one which follows the policy of alliance with the workers and peasants. To give up this policy, to reject the help of the workers and peasants, to ignore putting into practice the will of Dr. Sun which calls for the "awakening of the people," these are preparations

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the failure of the revolution and for the failure of the war of resistance.

Stalin said, "The question of the colonies and semi-colonies is essentially that of the peasants." That is to say, the Chinese revolution is essentially a peasant revolution. The present war of resistance is substantially a peasant war of resistance. The policies of the new democracy are essentially aimed at giving rights to the peasants. The new, the genuine *San Min Chu I* is the peasant revolution in practice. Popular culture, in practice, means to raise the cultural standard of the peasants. Just now there is a vogue for "climbing hills." People have set up offices in the hills; they hold meetings in the hills; they lecture, print newspapers, read, perform plays — everything takes place in the hills. In practice all these activities are for the peasants. Everything for the war of resistance and everything for the life of our country is provided by the peasants. When I use the terms "in practice" and "essentially" as referring to our tasks, I mean "basically"; this does not mean neglecting other problems.

Stalin's comment that China's population is 80 per cent peasant is known by every pupil in elementary school. Since the fall of the big cities, this percentage has even gone above 80 per cent. The peasants question, therefore, has now become the fundamental problem of the Chinese revolution. The force of the peasants is the main force of the revolution.

The workers are the second section of the Chinese population. China has several millions of workers, and hundreds of millions of handicraftsmen and agricultural workers. Without them China cannot live, because they produce our industrial economy. Without them the revolution cannot succeed, because they are its leaders. Therefore, I repeat, the revolutionary, the new, the genuine *San Min Chu I* must follow the policy of alliance with the peasants and workers. Any *San Min Chu I* which does not have such an alliance, which does not sincerely help the peasants and workers, which does not carry out Dr. Sun's injunction to awaken the people, is doomed to perish.

It is clear from the foregoing that the *San Min Chu I* which deviates from the policy of alliance with the U.S.S.R., with the Communist Party and with the peasants and workers, will have no future. Every conscientious follower of *San Min Chu I* must seriously consider this point. This *San Min Chu I* of the three policies is a revolutionary, a new, a genuine *San Min Chu I*. It is the *San Min Chu I* of the new democracy, developed from the old *San Min Chu I*.

The production of this doctrine during the period when the Chinese revolution entered the phase of being a part of the world socialist revolution is Dr. Sun's great contribution. This is the *San Min Chu I* which we say is needed in China today. And the Communists are willing to struggle for its thorough realization. This *San Min Chu I* and this alone is fundamentally in accord with the Communist pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gram for the democratic stage of the revolution, that is, the immediate program. The old *San Min Chu I* was the product of the old period of the Chinese Revolution. At that time Russia was an imperialist nation; therefore it was impossible to follow a policy of alliance with her. At that time there was no Communist Party in or outside China; it was therefore impossible for *San Min Chu I* to follow a policy of alliance with it. At that time the peasants' and workers' movement had not developed its political importance; therefore it was impossible for *San Min Chu I* to follow a policy of alliance with the workers and peasants.

Thus, the *San Min Chu I* which existed before the reorganization of the Kuomintang in 1924 belongs to the old category. It is now out of date. The Kuomintang could not make progress without developing a new *San Min Chu I*. Dr. Sun, with his great intelligence, saw this point. Aided by the Chinese Communist Party and by Lenin, he reinterpreted *San Min Chu I* in accord with the new historical characteristics. Thus, the united front of *San Min Chu I* and the Communist Party was established, and, with the sympathy of the whole people, the first great revolution was begun.

The old *San Min Chu I* marked the historical characteristics of the revolution of the old period. In the new period of today, when a new *San Min Chu I* has been set up, when there is in the world a socialist country and a Communist Party, and when the peasants and workers have demonstrated their great political power, it is futile to dig out the old *San Min Chu I* and use it to oppose the policy of alliance with the U.S.S.R., the Communist Party, and the peasants and workers. The reaction after 1927 was the direct result of such stupidity. As the old saying has it, "He who knows the situation is a great man." I want to recommend this adage to the followers of *San Min Chu I*.

Until the accomplishment of its fundamental mission to defeat imperialism and feudalism, the new *San Min Chu I* cannot be discarded. Only such as Wang Ching-wei and his friends could discard it. No matter how busily and energetically Wang Ching-wei and his adherents pursue their anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, anti-peasant, anti-worker activities in the name of a false *San Min Chu I*, all conscientious, loyal people will continue to support only the genuine *San Min Chu I*. Just as many genuine followers of *San Min Chu I* fought for the Chinese revolution after the reaction of 1927, today, when our national enemy is in our very midst, the number of these people will be increased manifold. We Communists are pledged to cooperate with all who adhere to the genuine *San Min Chu I*. We stand against all traitors and stubborn elements, but we never desert friends.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STALIN—GENIUS OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

BY DONALD MAC KENZIE LESTER

SPEAKING at the Sixth Congress of the Bolshevik Party in August, 1917, Joseph Stalin said "There is dogmatic Marxism and creative Marxism. I stand on the basis of the latter." [1] * Those words, hurled at the opportunist "critics" of the Lenin-Stalin line of proletarian revolution in Russia, define Joseph Stalin's relationship to the theory and practice of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

It was because he stood by creative Marxism that Stalin was Lenin's best disciple. Precisely because Marxism-Leninism is dynamic and not static, because it is a guide to action and not a dogma, Marxist-Leninist discipleship by its very nature implies creative participation in the process of elaborating and developing the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

Stalin does not emerge with the passing of Lenin in 1924. Stalin, the great disciple and continuer of Lenin, was the product of a full quarter of a century of creative participation with Lenin in elaborating and developing the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism.

The past year has brought to the American student of Marxism-Leninism, for the first time, a rich source of material with regard to the work and writings of Joseph Stalin. The brilliant biographical essay by Emilian Yaroslavsky, [2] the indispensable source-book by Beria [3] and the profound essays written by Stalin's co-workers in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday [4]—all shed new light on this greatest man of our era.

This material, new to the American student, overwhelmingly confirms the creative character of Stalin's Leninist discipleship.

"Leninism," writes Stalin, "is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. Or, to be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular." [5]

* All source references, indicated by superior numbers in the text, are given at the end of the article.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stalin's contributions to Marxism-Leninism are directly related to developing the theory and tactics of this core of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade Manuilsky, in his brilliant essay "The Great Theoretician of Communism," expresses this in the following words:

"Thanks to Comrade Stalin's theoretical and practical constructive work, Marxism-Leninism today is the Marxism not only of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, *but also of the era of the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the globe.*" [6]

To discuss fully the role of Stalin as disciple and continuer of Lenin would entail a complete examination of the entire development of Marxism in our century, the whole history of the Bolshevik Party and of the world revolutionary movement; for, in a very real and intimate sense, all of these are part of the development of Stalin's lifework. With every passing hour the titanic figure of this magnificent leader becomes more inextricably bound up with the very destiny of world humanity.

It is the purpose of this article to discuss the theoretical and practical contribution of Stalin to the solution of the main problems of the socialist revolution in the period subsequent to Lenin's death.

The Perspective of Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R.

In the year following Lenin's death, changes in the international situation as well as in the internal situation in the Soviet Union presented a momentous question for solution. The rehabilitation of industry and agriculture was progressing rapidly. The first round of wars and revolutions had given way to the temporary and partial stabilization of capitalism. Both developments contributed to raising sharply for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government the question of the perspective of the socialist state.

What effect would capitalist stabilization have on the future of socialism in the U.S.S.R.? Given the continuance of capitalism for a period in other lands, could socialism be built in the industrially and technically backward country under proletarian government? And what of the possibility of intervention and capitalist restoration in the conditions of capitalist encirclement?

These theoretical questions presented themselves as bound up with immediate reality of practice.

As early as 1915, on the basis of the intensified uneven development of capitalism in the imperialist epoch, Lenin had supplied the theoretical answer to the main question. He wrote:

"Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own socialist production, would confront

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries." [7]

This thesis indicated, not only the possibility of the proletariat at the head of the masses in a single country breaking through the imperialist system at its weakest link, but also the possibility of the victorious proletariat of that country organizing socialist construction, save for successful intervention by world imperialism.

Stalin, basing himself on Lenin's analysis of imperialism, developed that analysis further, elaborating the theory of the general crisis of capitalism. He laid bare the temporary and precarious character of the partial capitalist stabilization which set in with the defeat of the revolutionary movement in the West. Stalin taught:

"Stabilization under capitalism, while temporarily strengthening capital, at the same time necessarily leads to an intensification of the contradictions inherent in capitalism. . . . The fact is that capitalism cannot develop without intensifying the exploitation of the working class, without keeping the large majority of the toilers in a condition of semi-starvation, without increasing the oppression of colonies and dependencies, without conflicts and clashes among the various imperialist groups of the bourgeoisie." [8]

Hence, this stabilization was laying the foundation for future crises and a new round of wars and revolutions.

Furthermore, the defeat of the military intervention of the imperialists by the Soviet toilers was followed by "the rapid growth of the economic development of the Soviet Union and the growth of its political might." Hence, side by side with the temporary stabilization in the capitalist world, there proceeded the stabilization of the Soviet system, and the entrenchment of working class rule in the U.S.S.R., fortress of the world socialist and anti-imperialist forces.

However, there was a vast difference in the two stabilizations. Stabilization under the Soviet system,

". . . while strengthening socialism, necessarily leads at the same time to the diminution of contradictions and to an improvement in the relations (a) between the proletariat and the peasantry of our country, (b) between the proletariat and the colonial peoples of oppressed countries, (c) between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the workers of all countries.

". . . But the Soviet system and the dictatorship of the proletariat can develop only by constantly raising the material and cultural level of the working class, by constantly improving the conditions of all the toilers in the Soviet Union, by progressively uniting and bringing the workers of all countries more closely together, by rallying the oppressed peoples in colonies and dependencies to the revolutionary movement of the proletariat." [9]

Out of these two fundamentally differing stabilizations there had arisen a "provisional equilibrium of forces" a kind of "peaceful co-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

habitation" of the proletarian and bourgeois systems.

"The foundation of this state of affairs," said Stalin, "is formed by the internal weakness of world capitalism, on the one hand, and the growth of the revolutionary labor movement, on the other; and especially by the growth of our own forces, the forces of the U.S.S.R." [10]

On the basis of this elaboration of the theory of the general crisis of capitalism, and the working out of the New Economic Policy, Comrade Stalin gave the bold Leninist answer to the question posed by the new situation on the future of socialism in the Soviet Union: "We advocate the path of socialist construction. That is, and will remain, the Party aim." [11]

The Key Problem of Socialist Construction

The rough outlines of the future socialist society had already been sketched by Marx and Engels. Lenin and Stalin had drawn heavily on their work in shaping the economic and political policies of the Soviet Government in the first days of the October Revolution, in the dark days of the civil war, and in the ensuing difficult period of rehabilitation. Lenin indicated a more far-reaching development in 1920 in approving the "Goelro" * plan for the electrification of the country—the first practical plan for socialist construction—when he voiced the profound slogan: "Soviet Power plus electrification spell Communism." However, the task of leadership in the actual socialist construction, which resulted in the world-historic victory of socialism over one-sixth of the world, rested on Lenin's foremost disciple and great continuer, Stalin.

What, in essence, was the basic class problem involved in the question of socialist construction? Stalin showed that just as the dictatorship of the proletariat is the core of Marxist-Leninist theory so the essence of the proletarian dictatorship is the alliance between the proletariat and the toiling masses in the countryside. Lenin had taught that the dictatorship of the proletariat was "a special kind of class alliance," that "the supreme principle of the dictatorship is the preservation of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, in order that the proletariat may retain the leading role and state power" and thus be enabled to guide the revolution to its complete victory, to socialism.

"When," said Stalin, "the question is asked: 'Is it possible to build socialism by our own efforts?'—what is really meant is: 'Can the contradictions existing between the proletariat and the peasantry in our country be overcome or are they insurmountable?'" [12]

That was the key question. Either, as Stalin said, "organize construction in such a way as will rally all toilers around the proletariat" and "carry on this work in such a way as will prepare for the liquidation,

* State Commission for the Electrification of Russia, known as G.O.E.L.R.O. from the initials of its Russian name.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the extinction of classes," or, deny the possibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union, and thereby deny the expediency of the October Revolution itself.

The stubborn resistance of the reactionary class elements within the Soviet Union against the building of socialism found expression under the leadership of Trotsky and his various groups of supporters. At the same time the outside imperialist interventionist forces, plotting a war of extermination against the rising socialist state, found a ready-made instrument in the form of the aggregate groups of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Bukharin-Rykoff within the socialist country and behind the back of the Soviet Power.

A widespread apparatus, constructed for the purposes of sabotage, espionage, military conspiracy in support of foreign intervention, and for murder of the leaders of the Communist Party and of the socialist state, was built up and put into operation by the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin-Rykoff combination of groups with the direct financial and material support of the diplomatic and military organizations of several foreign imperialist powers.

However, the structure of this apparatus of counter-revolution was built up behind a facade of so-called "theoretical" views and self-proclaimed ultra-revolutionary views in opposition to the whole Marxian-Leninist-Stalinist program of building socialism in the socialist country and the laying of its foundation in the rapid development of the powerful heavy industry.

Counterposing the peasantry to the proletariat, the Trotskyites maintained that the contradictions between industrial workers and the peasantry were such as to compel the socialist state to come into "hostile collision . . . with the broad masses of the peasants." This anti-Leninist "theory," paraded by Trotsky under the name of "permanent revolution," was in essence a denial of the possibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union. It was in fact the disguised program of the imperialist interventionists.

The Zinoviev group, maintaining that the economic and technical backwardness inherited from the old tsarist Russia made imposible the building of socialism by the Soviet Power through the strength of its own peoples, became a part of the Trotskyist counter-revolutionary group. The equally degenerate group of Bukharin and Rykoff, in the same corrupt secret relations with foreign interventionist powers, propagated views which implied a denial of the possibility of building socialism in the Soviet country, maintaining the "theory" that there had come about a "subsidence of the class struggle" in the Soviet Union and that there would be a "peaceful growing of capitalism into socialism."

In a series of profound and brilliant articles and reports, notably "The Foundations of Leninism," "Problems of Leninism" and "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists," Comrade Stalin exposed and smashed the Trotskyite-Zinovievite and Bukharinite demagogy.

Stalin reaffirmed the Leninist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position on the peasant question. He pointed to the differentiation within the peasantry, that "the peasantry includes many semi-proletarian as well as petty-bourgeois elements" and that, especially in view of the possession of power by the proletariat and the nationalization of the land, the masses of the peasantry could be won for socialist construction—providing that the correct Leninist policy of relying on the poor peasant, coming to an agreement with the middle peasant, and not for a moment ceasing to fight against the rich peasants, the kulaks, was carried out.

Why was this possible? Because, Stalin taught, there are not only antagonisms between the proletariat and the peasantry, but also a community of interests:

"The point is that there are two paths along which agriculture can develop: the capitalist path and the socialist path. The capitalist path means development through the impoverishment of the majority of the peasantry for the sake of enriching the upper strata of the urban and rural bourgeoisie. The socialist path, on the contrary, means development through steady improvement in the standard of living of the majority of the peasantry. The proletariat, and particularly the peasantry, are interested in seeing development proceed along the second path, along the socialist path; for this path is the only path of salvation of the peasantry from poverty and semi-starvation." [13]

Furthermore, Comrade Stalin exposed the fact that the false views propagated by Trotsky "consisted not only in their underestimation of the role of the peasantry, but also in their underestimation of the strength and ability of the proletariat to lead the peasantry, and in their lack of faith in the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat." [14] Therefore, Trotskyism was in reality a variety of Menshevism, a reformulation of their position on the question of the peasantry and the leading role of the proletariat, combatted and defeated by Lenin and the Bolsheviks at the Second and Third Congresses of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party in 1903 and 1905.

Moreover, Trotsky's dupes were blinded to the fact that, since the October Revolution, political power and the main threads of economic life (basic industry, finance and foreign trade) were in the hands of the proletarian government. The proletariat could and would use that power to help the peasantry take the path of the socialist development.

Again, Comrade Stalin showed that Trotsky's whining about the impossibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. without "direct state aid" as a result of the victory of the proletarian revolution in the West not only rested upon these falsities, but upon ignoring the character of imperialism.

Did the Soviet Union need the support of the international proletariat?

"Of course," taught Stalin, "we need support. But what is meant by the support of our revolution by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the West European proletariat? The sympathy of the European workers for our revolution, their readiness to thwart the imperialists' plans of intervention—is not all that support; is that not real assistance? Of course it is. Without such support, without such assistance, not only from the European workers but also from the colonial and dependent countries, the proletarian dictatorship in Russia would have been in a tight corner. Has this sympathy and this assistance, coupled with the power of the Red Army and the readiness of the workers and peasants of Russia to defend their socialist fatherland to the last gasp, has all this been sufficient to beat off the attacks of the imperialists and to win for ourselves the necessary conditions for the serious work of construction? Yes, it has been sufficient. Is this sympathy growing stronger, or ebbing away? Beyond question, it is growing stronger. Hence, have we got favorable conditions not only to push on with the organization of socialist economy, but also in our turn to give support to the West European workers as well as to the oppressed peoples of the East? Certainly we have. This is eloquently proved by the seven years' history of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia." [15]

Hence, Trotskyism proved to be nothing but the Menshevik denial of the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R., covering up its theoretical bankruptcy with "Left" phrases about "permanent" and "world" revolution.

The Dialectics of Socialist Construction

The building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. was no simple process of growth, but a dialectical process of struggle.

Stalin teaches us that, "The dialectical method . . . holds that the process of development from the lower to the higher takes place not as a harmonious unfolding of phenomena, but as a disclosure of the contradictions inherent in things and phenomena, as a 'struggle' of opposite tendencies which operate on the basis of these contradictions." [16]

Comrade Stalin did more than give the theoretical Leninist answer to the question as to whether socialism could be built in the Soviet Union. Stalin's genius provided the concrete, practical keys, and elaborated the theoretical problems relating to the overcoming of the contradictions by which Soviet society advanced to socialism and now moves toward the transition to communism.

The history of socialist construction in the Soviet Union is, therefore, the history of the struggle to overcome the contradictions confronting the U.S.S.R. at various stages in the course of its development. We shall examine briefly Stalin's role in providing solutions to the three main contradictions in the process of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. First, the contradiction between the advanced form of the state, Soviet Power, and the low technical and economic level of the country. Secondly, the contradiction between advanced socialist industry and backward small-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scale peasant individualistic production in agriculture. And, finally, the contradiction between socialism in the Soviet Union and capitalism in the surrounding world.

Socialist Industrialization

The problems confronting the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government in the early stages of socialist construction arose out of the contradiction between the advanced form of the Soviet state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the low technical and economic level of the country.

Stalin thus formulated the question:

". . . On the one hand, we have in our country the most advanced government in the world, the Soviet Government, while on the other, our industry, which is the basis for socialism and the Soviet Government, is extremely backward. Do you think that as long as this contradiction persists the final victory of socialism is possible?" [17]

How was this contradiction to be overcome? Stalin's answer was:

"We must do everything in our power to overtake and surpass the technical development of the more advanced capitalist countries. We have overtaken and surpassed the most advanced capitalist countries in establishing a new political system, the Soviet system. That is all very good, but it is not enough. In order to secure the final triumph of socialism, we must overtake and surpass these countries also in technique and economic structure. We have got to do that, or be wiped out. And that applies not only to the building up of socialism; it applies also to the preservation of the independence of our country, surrounded as it is by a capitalist environment." [18]

Only industrialization of the Soviet Union could put an end to this contradiction, preserve the independence of the country, and provide a firm economic basis to the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. For, as Lenin had observed:

"As long as we live in a small-peasant country there will be a more solid economic basis for capitalism than for communism. That must not be forgotten. Those who closely observe the life of the countryside in comparison with that of the town know that we have not eradicated the roots of capitalism and that we have not undermined the base and support of our internal enemy. The latter is supported by petty economy, and there is only one way of undermining him, to transform the economic life of the country, including agriculture, on a new technical basis, the technical basis of modern, large-scale production." [19]

The economic victory over capitalism could be achieved only by converting agrarian Russia into industrial Russia. "The conversion of our country from an agrarian into an industrial country able to produce the machinery it needs by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its own efforts—that is the essence, the basis of our general line." That is how Stalin gave the answer at the Fourteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1925.

In spite of all difficulties, difficulties due to the backwardness of Soviet industry and its low technical level, difficulties of accumulating reserves for industrial expansion in the face of the capitalist financial blockade, socialist industrialization registered great achievements in the years following the Fourteenth Party Congress.

Stalin's teaching that the road to socialism was not one of the "subsidence of the class struggle" was borne out in the period of the struggle for socialist industrialization. The successes of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. were so great as to inspire fear in the imperialist governments with regard to its effect on the capitalist world. They unloosed a series of provocative acts against the Soviet country designed to create difficulties for the Soviet Union and disrupt the industrialization program. These external attacks were coupled with the criminal disruptive provocations by the Trotskyite lackeys of imperialism. Comrade Stalin observed that "something like a united front from Chamberlain to Trotsky is being formed" against the Soviet Government. But the provocative efforts of both the external and internal enemies were repulsed by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, guided by Comrade Stalin.

Industrialization and the Lag in Agriculture

However, this period not only registered decisive victories for socialist industrialization, it also registered the fact that agriculture was seriously lagging behind the rapidly growing industry. Although the total quantity of grain production was only slightly under that of the pre-war period, the amount of grain available for the market was only a little more than a third of that available in the pre-war period.

The large landlord farms that formerly produced for the market were no more. Their land was now in the hands of the peasants. The 16,000,000 peasant households of 1913 had swollen to 25,000,000 by 1927. But these small peasant farms, while raising the living standards of the peasant masses, were producing only a small surplus of grain for the market, for the population of the rapidly growing towns and cities of the emerging industrial U.S.S.R.

What did this crisis mean fundamentally? It evidenced the accentuation of a contradiction in Soviet economy, the contradiction between the advancing socialist industry and the stagnant agriculture based on individual petty peasant husbandry. "Can industry advance while agriculture remains in a state of complete technical backwardness, while the agricultural base of industry is not guaranteed, and while agriculture itself

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not reconstructed and brought up to the level of industry?" That is how Stalin posed the question. His reply was: "No, it cannot be done."

"It is impossible endlessly, that is, for a considerable length of time, to base the Soviet system and socialist construction on two different foundations, on the foundation of large-scale and highly concentrated socialist industry, and on the foundation of very fragmentary and extremely backward small commodity peasant production. Gradually, but systematically and persistently, we must place our agriculture on a new technical basis, the basis of large-scale production, and raise it to the level of socialized industry." [20]

How is this to be achieved? Stalin answers:

"But how are the peasant farms to be combined to form larger units? There are two ways: the *capitalist* way, in which the agricultural units are enlarged by grafting capitalism upon them, and which leads to the impoverishment of the peasantry and to the development of capitalist enterprises in agriculture. We have rejected this way, for it is incompatible with Soviet economics. There is a second way: the *socialist* way, which is to set up collective and Soviet farms. This way leads to the combination of the small peasant farms in large collective ones, technically and scientifically equipped, and results in the squeezing out of capitalist elements from agriculture. We are in favor of this second way.

"We therefore have to choose between the one way and the other! Either *back* to capitalism or *forward* to socialism. There is no third way, and there cannot be one." [21]

But can the mass of the peasantry be induced to abandon petty peasant production for large-scale collective farm production? "It must after all," said Stalin, "be understood that the alliance between the working class and the peasantry is one of calculation of advantages, it is an alliance of the interests of two classes, it is a class alliance between the workers and the main mass of the peasants for their mutual advantage." [22] Therefore it is obvious that the peasants will take the path of collectivization only in the event that the proletariat and its state power can demonstrate in concrete terms the advantages.

That meant, Stalin pointed out, providing a new economic basis for the alliance of proletariat and peasantry. While the old bond had been based on supplying goods to satisfy the personal needs of the peasants—shoes, clothes, etc.—the new bond must be based upon satisfying the productive needs of the peasantry—fertilizer, agricultural equipment, etc. The wooden plow and winter-starved nag must give way to the steel plow and the tractor. To quote Stalin:

". . . We must throw a bridge between the poor and middle-peasant farms and the collective and socialized forms of farming, in the shape of the contract system* on a mass

* The contract system represented a form of large-scale commodity exchange between state enterprises and the peasant cooperatives for the exchange of industrial and agricultural products.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scale, in the shape of machine and tractor stations, and in the shape of the fullest development of the cooperative movement in order to help the peasants to transfer their small, individual enterprises to the lines of collective labor. Without these conditions, serious development of agriculture is impossible." [23]

Hence the conclusions. "The key to the reconstruction of agriculture is the rapid rate of the development of our industry."

Rapid industrialization was the key to further advance of socialist industry and to the transformation of agriculture. Furthermore, it was the key to the independence of the country, to the defense of the Soviet Union. Replying to the whining cavil of the Bukharinites who complained about the "tempo" of industrialization, Stalin sharply pointed out that the U.S.S.R. must "overtake and surpass the capitalist countries economically" or "be wiped out." [24]

The Stalinist policy of rapid industrialization paralleled by the collectivization of agriculture—a policy of a general offensive against the capitalist elements and aimed at eradicating the very roots of capitalism in the national economy—was enthusiastically endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the Communist Party and the working class. The Sixteenth Conference of the C.P.S.U., meeting in the spring of 1929, rejected the Bukharinite variant of the First Five-Year Plan, which called for slow industrialization with emphasis on light industry, and approved the draft of the plan presented by the Central Committee, which called for rapid industrialization and concentration on heavy industry.

Even in 1927 the total investments in industrial development were only about one billion rubles, while the investments in the other branches of economy were relatively insignificant. As against this, the investments for the duration of the historic First Five-Year Plan were set at 64.6 billion rubles; of this sum nearly 20 billion rubles were assigned for industrial and electric power development, 10 billion rubles for transport, and over 23 billion rubles for agriculture. The fundamental task of the plan, as stated by Stalin, "was to create such an industry in our country as would be able to re-equip and reorganize not only the whole of industry but also transport and agriculture, on the basis of socialism."

The Collectivization of Agriculture

Experimental collective farms had been in existence for several years, and collectivization on a mass scale was initiated by the Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., held in December, 1927. That was the Congress which called for the drafting of the First Five-Year Plan. Collectivization at first proceeded at a relatively slow pace, but 1929 registered marked and rapid progress. That year, to quote the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, "the peasants definitely began to turn to collective farming." From then on, in face of the desperate resistance of the kulaks and all counter-revolutionary ele-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments, collectivization took on the character of an irresistible wave.

In his famous article "A Year of Great Change," written on the occasion of the twelfth anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade Stalin characterized the progress of collectivization as

". . . a *radical change* in the development of our agriculture from the small, backward *individual* farming to large-scale advanced *collective* agriculture. In a large number of regions we have been able to *divert* the majority of the peasant masses from the old *capitalist* path of development, from which only a small group of rich capitalists benefit, while the vast majority of the peasants are compelled to suffer in poverty, to the new *socialist* path of development, which squeezes out the wealthy capitalists, which re-equips the middle and poor peasants, supplies them with new implements, tractors and agricultural machinery, and enables them to climb out of poverty and enslavement to the kulaks onto the broad path of joint and collective tillage." [25]

While in 1928 the collective farms had a total crop area of 1,390,000 hectares,* the area more than trebled in 1929, reaching a total of 4,262,000 hectares. In 1930 it leaped to 36,000,000 hectares, and by the end of 1934 the collective farms consisted of about 90 per cent of the total crop area of the Soviet Union.

How was this victory won? It was won because the proletariat, through its Party and its government, exercised its hegemony, its leading role in the "class alliance of a special kind."

"Victory never comes by itself—it has to be dragged by the hand," Stalin said. This was true of collectivization. Discussing this question in his report to the Sixteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., Stalin declared:

". . . It is not enough to issue a slogan to get the peasantry to turn toward socialism. To secure such a change at least one more circumstance is needed, namely, that the masses of the peasantry themselves should become convinced of the correctness of the slogan proclaimed, and should adopt it as their own." [26]

How were the peasantry able to convince themselves of the correctness of the Party's slogan on collective agriculture? Stalin enumerates five elements in the preparation for the change:

"It was prepared by the whole course of our development, the whole course of development of our industry, and particularly the development of those branches of industry which supply machines and tractors for agriculture. It was prepared by our policy of decisive struggle against the rich peasantry (kulaks) and the course of our grain-collecting campaign in its new forms in 1928 and 1929, which placed the kulak farms under the control of the poor and middle peasant masses. It was prepared by the development of agricultural cooperation, which accustomed the individual peasant to the collective

* A hectare equals 2.471 acres.—*Ed.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

management of affairs. It was prepared by a network of collective farms, where the peasant tested out the advantage of collective forms of economy as compared with individual forms. It was prepared finally by the network of Soviet farms scattered throughout the whole of the U.S.S.R., and equipped with the new technique, where the peasant had the opportunity to become convinced of the strength and advantage of the new technique. . . .

"This is the basis on which arose that mass collective farm movement among millions of poor and middle peasants which began in the second half of 1929, and which opened a period of great change in the life of our country." [27]

Elsewhere Stalin wrote:

". . . the unprecedented success in the development of collective farming is due to the fact that the Soviet Government comprehended the crying need of the peasants for new implements and for a new technique, and realized the hopelessness of the peasants under the old methods of farming. And, having realized all this, it came to their aid in good time by organizing . . . collective tillage of the soil, by introducing collective farms, and, finally, arranged for the Soviet farms, to aid peasant farming. For the first time in the history of mankind there has appeared a government, the government of the Soviets, which has proved in action its readiness and ability to give systematic and prolonged *productive* aid to the toiling masses of the peasantry." [28]

This revolutionary reconstruction of agriculture and the transformation of the countryside, the Agrarian October, involved a ruthless class struggle in the countryside. It meant passing over from the policy of restricting the exploitative operations of the kulaks to the policy of eliminating their base, of uprooting them as a class. It meant, therefore, that the mass of poor and middle peasants must wage, under the leadership and guidance of the working class, a determined struggle to smash the kulaks once and for all.

"In order to squeeze the kulaks out as a class, a policy of restricting and squeezing out individual sections of the kulaks is not enough. In order to squeeze the kulaks out as a class we must *break down* the resistance of this class in open fight and *deprive* it of the productive sources of its existence and development (the free use of land, means of production, leases, the right to hire labor, etc.). This marks the *turn* toward the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class. Without that, all talk of squeezing the kulaks out as a class is idle chatter, pleasing and profitable only to the Right deviationists. Without that, serious, not to speak of mass collectivization of the countryside is inconceivable. The poor and middle peasants in our village who are smashing up the kulaks and carrying out mass collectivization have understood that quite well." [29]

Here it is necessary to remember who the kulaks were. To remember that the kulaks were the rich capitalist farmer, the rural bourgeoisie, the most numerous capitalist class. To remember that they fostered

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalist exploitation, daily and hourly. To remember that they were the last capitalist class, the last social base within the country upon which imperialist intervention could depend, the last ally of world counter-revolution against the victorious forward march of socialism in the U.S.S.R. It was, therefore, no accident that in this final struggle to wipe out the last phalanx of the capitalist class, the kulaks, the anti-Soviet and anti-Communist plotters united their forces in a "Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," working in concert with the world imperialist bourgeoisie, in a desperate effort to stem the rising tide of socialism.

The historic significance of collectivization is depicted in the *History of the C.P.S.U.* as follows:

"This was a profound revolution, a leap from an old qualitative state of society to a new qualitative state, equivalent in its consequences to the Revolution of October, 1917. . . .

"This revolution, at one blow, solved three fundamental problems of socialist construction:

"(a) It eliminated the most numerous class of exploiters in our country, the kulak class, the mainstay of capitalist restoration;

"(b) It transferred the most numerous laboring class in our country, the peasant class, from the path of individual farming, which breeds capitalism, to the path of cooperative, collective, socialist farming;

"(c) It furnished the Soviet regime with a socialist base in agriculture—the most extensive and vitally necessary, yet least developed, branch of national economy.

"This destroyed the last mainsprings of the restoration of capitalism within the country and at the same time created new and decisive conditions for the building up of a socialist economic system." [30]

Thus had the Lenin-Stalin position on the peasant question—first formulated in Lenin's pamphlet *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight Against the Social-Democrats,* written in 1894 and successfully fought for during three revolutions, Civil War, restoration and reconstruction, against every variety of opportunism and counter-revolution—proved itself correct to the very hilt. Guided by the advanced class, the proletariat, the horny-handed mass of the peasantry had delivered the final blow, in violent class struggle, against the last bulwark of capitalism, and, together with the working class, secured the foundations of socialism in the Soviet Union. The "irrevocable victory of socialism" in the U.S.S.R. was registered by the "Congress of Victors," the Seventeenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., in 1934.

Stalin, disciple and continuer of Lenin, and leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was the theoretician, leader and organizer of the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. Building on the foundations of the "Marxism of the imperialist epoch" he constructed the "Marxism of the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the globe."

The "supreme principle" of the proletarian dictatorship, the alliance of proletariat and peasantry, was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grounded in the secure economic foundation of socialist industry and collective agriculture. The "alliance between classes which differ economically, politically, socially and ideologically" gave way to a union of "two friendly classes." Article I of the great Stalinist Constitution sums up this unshakable unity in the historic assertion that "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of workers and peasants."

* * *

It was to be expected that the period of the achievement of the irrevocable victory of socialism should call forth a violent struggle of the declassed remnants of the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union, the Trotskyite-Bukharinite gang of assassins, aided and abetted by the imperialist bourgeoisie, fascist and "democratic" alike.

In 1930, at the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin, exposing the Bukharin "theory" of the "subsidence of the class struggle," warned:

". . . we must bear in mind the fact that the resistance of the dying classes in our country does not take place in isolation from the outside world, but finds support from the capitalists who encircle us. Capitalist encirclement is not simply a geographical conception. Capitalist encirclement means that around the U.S.S.R. there are hostile class forces ready to support our class enemies within the U.S.S.R. morally, materially, by means of financial blockade and, when opportunity offers, by means of military intervention. It has been proved that the wrecking tactics of our technical experts, the anti-Soviet acts of our kulaks, the burning and blowing up of our factories and public works, are subsidized and inspired from outside. The imperialist world is not interested in having the U.S.S.R. stand on its own legs and develop the ability to overtake and surpass the foremost capitalist countries. Hence the aid it grants to the forces of the old world in the U.S.S.R. Naturally, this circumstance also does not serve to lighten our burden of reconstruction." [31]

Stalin also gave the classic definition of Trotskyism:

". . . Trotskyism is the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, which is carrying on the struggle against communism, against the Soviet government, against the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R." [32]

Reporting to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March, 1937, Stalin warned of the meaning of the capitalist encirclement in the conditions of the newest, most sweeping and deepest crisis of capitalism, and demonstrated that:

"Present-day Trotskyism is not a political trend in the working class but a gang without principle, without ideas, of wreckers, diversionists, intelligence service agents, spies, murderers, a gang of sworn enemies of the working class, working in the pay of the intelligence services of foreign states." [33]

The subsequent trials of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites" fully confirmed that this was likewise the character of the Bukharinite allies of Trotskyism and the international imperialist bourgeoisie.

The Socialist World vs. the Capitalist World

The magnificent victories of socialist construction in the Soviet Union at the very time when the encircling capitalist world was profoundly shaken by the most devastating economic crisis, and the tense international situation arising from the intensified capitalist contradictions and the clash of imperialist interests, greatly accentuated the contradiction between the rising world of socialism and the moribund world of capitalism.

With reference to this contradiction Stalin, in his *Leninism,* discussing the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the morrow of its victory, clearly indicated its international task in these words:

"To arm the revolution and to organize the army of the revolution for the struggle against the external enemy and for the struggle against imperialism."

This task flows directly from the character of the problem of securing the victory of socialism in a single country, for the question of this victory embraces *two different problems.* The first is the problem of the internal relations, the relation of classes within the country. This was the basic problem of socialist construction which we have already discussed. This problem was solved by the efforts of the Soviet proletariat in alliance with the peasant masses.

The second aspect of the question is the problem of the external relations, the problem of insuring against the restoration of capitalism through military intervention. As we noted before, this involves the question of the *final* victory of socialism. Stalin said on this score, in his report to the Fourteenth Party Conference in April, 1925:

"The final victory of socialism is the complete guarantee against attempted intervention, and that means against restoration, for any serious attempt at restoration can take place only with serious support from outside, only with the support of international capital. Hence, the support of our revolution by the workers of all countries and still more the victory of the workers in at least several countries, is a necessary condition for completely guaranteeing the first victorious country against attempts at intervention and restoration, a necessary condition for the final victory of socialism." [34]

This is, in the last analysis, the very essence of proletarian internationalism—the necessity of solving its fundamental problems on a world scale, by the efforts of the whole international working class.

"Therefore," teaches Stalin, "those who, forgetting the international character of the October Revolution, declare the victory of socialism in one country to be purely national and only a national phenomenon, are wrong." [35]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Has the decisive victory of socialist construction within the Soviet Union altered the theoretical formulations made prior to that victory? Writing on this very question in February, 1938, Stalin observes:

". . . we say openly and honestly that the victory of socialism in our country is not yet final.

"From this it follows that the second problem is not yet solved and that it has yet to be solved. More than that, the second problem cannot be solved in the way that we solved the first problem, that is, solely by the efforts of our country. The second problem can be solved only by combining the serious efforts of the international proletariat with the still more serious efforts of the whole of our Soviet people." [36]

Stalin set forth the interacting relationship of the October Revolution with the world socialist forces:

"The world significance of the October Revolution lies not only in its constituting a great start made by one country in the work of breaking through the system of imperialism and the creation of the first land of socialism in the ocean of imperialist countries, but likewise in its constituting the first stage in the world revolution and a mighty basis for its further development." [37]

The contributions of the toilers of the U.S.S.R. to overcoming the contradiction between the Soviet Union and the capitalist encirclement were: To build socialism in the land of the victorious proletarian dictatorship; to create a mighty Red Army firmly based on socialist industry, collective agriculture and the moral and political unity of proletarian democracy; to carry out their consistent proletarian foreign policy based on victorious socialism and the mighty Red Army, and supported by the international working class and all progressive humanity.

On this basis, Comrade Stalin, theoretician, leader and organizer of the "irrevocable victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R.," prepares the "final victory of socialism."

Stalin thus formulated, at the Eighteenth Party Congress, in March, 1939, the new stage in the further socialist construction—the transition to communism:

"We have outstripped the principal capitalist countries as regards technique of production and rate of industrial development. That is very good, but it is not enough. We must outstrip them economically as well. We can do it, and we must do it. Only if we outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically can we reckon upon our country being fully saturated with consumers goods, on having an abundance of products, and on being able to make the transition from the first phase of communism to its second phase." [38]

Reviewing the international scene in his report to the Eighteenth Congress, and pointing out the rapidly developing war danger, Stalin declared:

". . . In view of this, while our country is unswervingly pursuing a policy of preserving peace, it is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the same time doing a great deal to increase the preparedness of our Red Army and our Red Navy." [39].

The character of the Soviet defense forces was demonstrated to the whole world on the "impregnable" Mannerheim Line as well as in the tests that Japan made on the Far Eastern borders of the Soviet Union.

The consistent socialist foreign policy was clearly outlined in these four points:

"1. We stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries. . . .

"2. We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. . . .

"3. We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country.

"4. We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war who attempt to violate the Soviet borders." [40]

This firm, independent, socialist peace policy has preserved peace on one-sixth of the earth and provided a rallying center for the peace-desiring peoples of the world. "The big and dangerous political game" of the organizers of the anti-Soviet war ended "in a serious fiasco" for them.

These achievements of Soviet foreign policy are Stalinist achievements. They flow directly from the victories of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and are firmly based on Comrade Stalin's theoretical contributions to the analysis of the general crisis of capitalism and the political transformations of bourgeois rule to which that crisis gives rise. It was Stalin who showed that the "democratic" and fascist forms of the bourgeois state were separated by no Chinese wall, but that, on the contrary, both were forms of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Reviewing the historic achievements of the Stalinist peace policy in the first year of the imperialist war, Comrade Molotov said:

"The successes of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union are all the more significant in that we have achieved them all by peaceful means, and in that the peaceful settlement of the questions both of the Baltic countries and Bessarabia was achieved with the active cooperation and support of the broad masses of the people of these countries." [41]

Peace in the midst of the raging imperialist war, 23,000,000 exploited people liberated and now part of the fraternal family of the Socialist Soviet Union—such is the result of the Soviet peace policy, which is an integral part of the program of preparing the liquidation of the contradiction between the Soviet Union and the capitalist encirclement.

And in the words of Comrade Molotov: ". . . we do not intend to rest content with what we have achieved." [42]

Thus has Comrade Stalin elab-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orated and developed the core of the Leninist theory of proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, fulfilling the solemn pledge made for the Party at the bier of Lenin. Under Stalin's guiding genius, the Soviet toilers have secured the irrevocable victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R.; have begun the great struggle for the transition from socialism, the first stage of communism, to the higher stage, communism; and have made of the great socialist state the cornerstone of freedom, peace, and hope for the future for the peoples of the world.

REFERENCES

(Except where otherwise noted, all references to Stalin's *Leninism* are to the edition by International Publishers (two volumes) which is based upon the ninth Russian edition of *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, 1933.)

[1] Lenin, Stalin, *The Russian Revolution*, p. 146. International Publishers, New York.
[2] *Landmarks in the Life of Stalin*, E. Yaroslavsky, Moscow, 1940.
[3] L. Beria, *Stalin's Early Writings and Activities: On the History of the Bolshevik Organizations in Transcaucasia*, International Publishers.
[4] *Stalin*, Molotov, Voroshilov, etc., Workers Library Publishers, New York, 1940.
[5] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 14, International Publishers.
[6] D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Communist International*, No. 1, p. 26, 1940.
[7] V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. V, p. 141.
[8] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 153.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 153
[10] *Ibid.* (British edition), p. 354.
Report to XIV Congress
[11] *Ibid.* (British edition.) p. 383.
[12] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 164.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 265.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 117.
[16] *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 109, International Publishers.
[17] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 72.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.
[19] Quoted in *Leninism*, Vol. II, pp. 76-77.
[20] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. II, p. 76.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 184.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 85.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.
[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 171-72.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 278.
[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 278-79
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 173.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 210.
[30] *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 305.
[31] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. II, pp. 294-95.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 403.
[33] Joseph Stalin, *Mastering Bolshevism*, p. 17, Workers Library Publishers.
[34] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 169.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
[36] Joseph Stalin, *Letter to Ivanov*, p. 13, International Publishers, New York.
[37] Joseph Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 137.
[38] Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 23.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[41] V. M. Molotov, *Soviet Foreign Relations*, p. 10, Workers Library Publishers.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STUART CHASE'S NOSTRUMS FOR DYING CAPITALISM

BY FRANK MEYER

THE accelerating decay of the capitalist system brings in its train such disastrous consequences for humanity that even the most hardened apologists of capitalism, the most blatant of fascist demagogues, the most servile of Social-Democratic "theoreticians" must at least admit that there is something seriously wrong with the capitalist world. They cannot but concede that there did take place a devastating economic crisis in 1929; that our economy has continued in a state of chronic depression since that time; that two disastrous wars have laid waste the world in the course of a single generation.

But their role is the role of apologists for capitalism. They cannot admit that the overwhelming problems of society, the agonies of nearly three decades, the colossal tragedy of starvation in the midst of plenty, of devastating imperialist war, *arise from the very nature of capitalism, are the peculiar product of the capitalist system of production itself.* At most, to them, it is not capitalism which is the source of the evils of society, but only this or that aspect of capitalism. Their proposals are all desperate efforts to preserve capitalism itself, while trying to reform away those results of capitalist exploitation which threaten the very existence of capitalism, to exorcise the specter of an awakened working class, the specter of communism.

Each one has his favorite cure. Anne Morrow Lindbergh with her "wave of the future," Lewis Mumford with his "militant democracy," his "new faith for living," try to mask their defense of capitalism by creating the ideology of a fascism supposedly "above classes." Harold Laski and his Social-Democratic colleagues in England and America beat the drums of a "revolution" led by Winston Churchill, of "war socialism" with the profits of British capital at new high marks. Even William Green comes out for support of this "revolution," whose field organizer is his brother-lackey, Sir Walter Citrine, and whose marching song is played on the cash registers of the City of London and of Wall Street.

Ideologues of War-Dictatorship

In the United States, with the development of F.D.R.'s war-dictatorship, the "economists" of the former New Deal are playing their part. This trend was indicated even in the palmiest days of the New Deal in such books as Jerome

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Frank's *Save America First.* It is the glorification of the rapacious finance capital of the second imperialist war as an "organized capitalism" allegedly directed toward serving the best interests of the people and able to bring about an economy of abundance if only certain simple reforms are carried out.

This is the position of the editors of the *Nation,* who ask us to imitate the "good" features of fascism, and write: "It [Hitlerism] is not counter-revolution, but the perversion of the revolution against capitalism. . . . Hitler has been producing for use—however vile that use may be" (*Nation,* December 7, 1940, p. 554.) It is the position of the whole crew of "learned flunkies" of the war machine, publicists like Max Lerner, "historians" like Louis Hacker in his *Triumph of American Capitalism.*

Stuart Chase, whose writings have over a period of years enjoyed wide popularity, plays essentially the same role. In his last book, *Idle Money, Idle Men* (Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1940), he attempts to show that American society today can "by a slight change of direction" meet the needs of the masses and develop a paradise of well being.

The fundamental thesis that runs through all his writings since the days of technocracy is repeated here in a form fitted to the needs of developing state capitalism: Apply a little common sense to the working of our society and it can be repaired, it can be made to run smoothly. There is no such thing after all, as "capitalism," "socialism," etc. These are all words. All we need is to make a few changes here and there in "the judgment of men to their technical inventions." (p. vii.)

Although he hopes that we do not go to war "despite its educational value in finance" (p. 246), Chase's analysis is one which helps to build the illusion that the war measures of Wall Street and the Roosevelt Administration are steps in the direction of overcoming the evils of our system. He put forward (for our capitalist society!) a program,

> ". . . the essense [of which] is the use of money to employ men and to move goods. If an interest rate of zero facilitates the movement, it will be used. If a heavy tax on the idle money facilitates the movement, it will be used. . . . We shall follow other nations in assuming that anything can be paid for if men and machines are unemployed, and materials are available." (p. 248.)

Chase sees nothing in the character of capitalist society itself to make "production for use" impossible. All that need be done is to reform the banking system and certain other "archaic institutions, habits which are beginning to rust." (p. vii.) Our society is ready for an easy transition to a heaven of organized production without disturbing the basic property relations of capitalism, if only such accidental rusty remnants as the financial system are brought up to date.

He expresses the dream of the petty bourgeoisie which wants to eliminate those aspects of the capitalist mode of production that lead to its own suffering and undermine its position in society; while at the same time it desires to preserve commodity production, private own-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ership of the means of production, and, therefore, the capitalist system itself.

Today Chase and the other petty-bourgeois "theoreticians" look to "organized capitalism" to achieve this dream; but Marx long ago, in his criticism of Proudhon, burst the bubble of this dream:

"From day to day it thus becomes clearer that the production relations in which the bourgeoisie moves have not a simple, uniform character, but a dual character; that in the self-same relations in which wealth is produced, poverty is produced also; that in the self-same relations in which there is a development of the productive forces, there is also a driving force of repression. . . . The more the antagonistic character comes to light, the more the economists, the scientific representatives of bourgeois production, find themselves in conflict with their own theory; and different schools arise. . . .

"The *philanthropic* school [for membership in which Mr. Chase is well qualified] . . . want to retain the categories which express bourgeois relations, without the antagonism which constitutes them and is inseparable from them." (Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, pp. 104 and 106, International Publishers, New York.)

Dr. Chase Prescribes for Capitalism

Chase's "cure" for capitalism, which obstinately refuses to develop into an organized system of production without antagonism of idle men and idle money, is summed up in his Foreword:

"Financial institutions . . . have a tendency to hamper the movement of goods and prevent their wide distribution to people who have lost the security of a self-sufficient handicraft culture. *It is financial habit which makes it so difficult to absorb unemployed men in useful work.* While their labor is utterly wasted, costing the community untold millions of man-years of effort, it is widely held that the community cannot 'afford' to employ them, that to do so is 'unsound.' Some of the essays in this book call for accelerated adjustment in the lag between technology and finance—the ability to produce and the ability to buy back. They explain why I think the American economy in one sense has reached maturity, and why, *by a slight change of direction*, its possibilities of development are almost limitless." (p. vii; emphasis mine—*F.M.*)

Let us examine the analysis upon which this faith in the emergence of a rejuvenated and beneficent progressive capitalism is founded.

Chase takes as his starting point the existence of the situation which he describes in the very title of his book, *Idle Money, Idle Men*—the phenomena, in fact, of a mass of accumulated wealth at one pole and a mass of accumulated misery at the other. Thus, he acknowledges the *effects* of the basic contradictions of capitalism; and the facts which he presents on the basis of the Temporary National Economic Committee hearings in Washington are a striking confirmation of the deepening of these contradictions.

The testimony of Dr. Laughlin Currie of the Federal Reserve Board Division of Research and Statistics

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at those hearings showed that at a national income of 70,000,000,000 to 80,000,000,000 accumulation (he calls it "saving") takes place at a rate of $15,000,000,000 per year on the average; that is to say, in the years 1923-29 at an average of 19.6 per cent of the national income, and in the year 1937 at the rate of 17.8 per cent of the national income. (*Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power, Temporary National Economic Committee*, Part 9, *Savings and Investment*, p. 4122.) At the same time he points out the development of an enormous gap between this accumulation and the possibilities for its investment in production, a gap estimated even in the 'twenties and in 1937 at over 50 per cent of the total accumulation. Thus, even in the most "prosperous" periods, more than half of the accumulated "savings" do not find their way into production, but take the form of over-enlarged inventories, speculation, idle bank deposits, swollen depreciation accounts, etc.—or of foreign loans, export of capital.

Likewise, Chase shows how the technological developments of the past few years make even the volume of production of 1929 insufficient to absorb the unemployed to any considerable degree under present conditions; and he graphically demonstrates the incapacity of the masses to purchase the commodities American economy can produce.

Describing the dilemma of overproduction while millions starve, he sees that without an increase in consuming power (the power of the people to buy food, shoes, radios, automobiles, etc.), the national "savings," *i.e.*, accumulated capital, will go begging, the national income will remain low, production will decline.

In a confused way he thus acknowledges a basic contradiction of the capitalist system, namely, that the restricted consuming power of the masses is, in the last analysis, the limiting factor upon the expanding productive power of society.

How does Chase propose to overcome this contradiction? In a sense, of course, he would be correct in stating that the problem is "the adjustment of men to their technological inventions" if by that he understood a revolutionary change in the relations of production, the transformation of capitalist relations into socialist relations, made necessary by the great socialized forces of production which capitalism has brought into existence and which are bursting the fetters of private ownership of the means of production and private appropriation of the products of society. But he does not so understand it. He sees this "adjustment" only as a problem of establishing "new habits of financial organization," of the tightening of a screw here and the polishing off of a little rust there, so that the old machine can function as well as ever.

Financial "Maladjustment" or Basic Contradiction?

The overcoming of this contradiction is for Chase merely a problem of redistribution of purchasing power to be achieved by reforming the financial system, by "redirecting the flow of money" to the lower income groups, a flow temporarily

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diverted because of the inefficiencies of our financial institutions.

The specific proposals which Chase brings forward to achieve this end we will examine later. The question now is—is the solution really so simple? Can capitalism be revitalized, its contradictions overcome, by setting aright some aspect of the system gone awry?

What Chase, and the whole crew of apologists for the existing order, seem unable to grasp is that *the motive force of production under capitalism is, and must remain, not the needs of the people, but profit, the creation of surplus value.*

From this springs an insoluble contradiction. For, while there is no limit to the *creation* of surplus value except the mass of accumulation of capital, the size of the working class, and the degree of its exploitation, the *realization* of surplus value (that is, the sale of the product containing the surplus value so that the capitalist may, in fact, be able really to get his hands on and utilize the surplus value) is another matter.

This product, the total product of society, is owned by the capitalist class and cannot be sold unless the consuming power of the people is great enough. For the product is composed of consumers' goods which the people buy directly and of producers' goods (new means of production), for which, in the long run, the demand depends upon the existence of a market for consumers' goods. Only if clothes and shoes and radios and automobiles, consumers' goods, are in growing demand will there be a growing demand for textile machinery and shoe machinery, for lathes and power presses and steel.

But the constant drive for profit, for the creation of surplus value, conditioned by the need to sell the commodities in the market, demands greater productivity and leads to an ever higher proportion of capital being invested in plant and machinery as compared to the investment in wages. This heightened organic composition of capital results in a surplus tendency for the rate of profit to decline, since surplus value is extracted out of that portion of the capital which is invested in the payment of wages (variable capital). So also do the wages of the working class fall in proportion to the total capital, the total productive power of society.

The declining rate of profit impels the capitalist class, and the higher organic composition of capital enables it, to drive ceaselessly for greater production and productive capacity, while simultaneously intensifying the exploitation of the working class (and therefore further limiting its consuming power).

Thus it is that *the very process of accumulation and expansion, which leads to ever greater possibilities of production, leads also to a relative decrease in the possibilities of consumption.*

It is therefore clear that the gap between the ever-rising productive power of capitalist economy (created by the capitalist drive for surplus value) and the ever-declining consuming power of the masses (likewise created by the drive for surplus value) is an inherent and inescapable characteristic of the capitalist system itself.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"But to the extent that the productive power develops, it finds itself at variance with the narrow basis on which the condition[s] of consumption rest. *On this self-contradictory basis, it is no contradiction at all that there should be an excess of capital simultaneously with an excess of population.* For, while the combination of these two would indeed increase the mass of the produced surplus value, it would at the same time intensify the contradiction between the conditions under which the surplus value is produced and those under which it is realized." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 287, Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1909; emphasis mine—*F.M.*)

With the development of monopoly capitalism, this contradiction is accentuated, becomes deeper and deeper. The accumulation of large masses of capital in the hands of fewer and fewer great corporations increases the gap between the potentialities of production and the consuming power. At home, the strength of the monopolies makes possible an enormous rise in the cost of living, together with an increase in the exploitation of the working class, as well as the robbery of the farmers, of the city middle classes, of the weaker capitalists, thus further sharply decreasing the consuming power in proportion to the continued increase of potential productive capacity. Abroad, monopoly capitalism, which is imperialism, spreads the contradictions of capitalism to the limits of the capitalist world, multiplying the gap between producing power and consuming power year by year.

This is no easily soluble paradox of "idle money, idle men" due to a maladjustment caused by incorrect financing methods and which can be remedied by a "slight change of direction." Rather, the accumulation of masses of idle means of production alongside of masses of unemployed men is the direct result of the capitalist mode of production itself, of the contradiction between productive forces ripe for socialism and the property relations of capitalism.

"The last cause of all real crisis always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as compared to the tendency of capitalist production to develop the productive forces in such a way that only the absolute power of consumption of the entire society [*i.e.*, the real needs of the people, not their ability to purchase] would be their limit." (*Ibid.*, p. 568.)

This is not to say that there is, therefore, no basis for a struggle of the working class to improve its conditions under capitalism. The working class fights and will fight for every additional cent of wages, for every possible improvement in hours, in conditions of work, in conditions of life; it fights and will fight to force the capitalist state to provide for the needs of the unemployed; it fights for social security, for the right to strike, for civil liberties. Without such a struggle its existence would become infinitely worse; by such a struggle at one and the same time it not only protects its conditions of living but also gains the experience on the basis of which it can develop the under-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standing and the strength to achieve its historic destiny, to bring capitalism to an end.

Chase's Proposals for Action

Chase's concrete proposals, which he presents as a cure for the gap between production and consumption, as "things to do which will put the American economy on its feet," as measures based upon rules for "operating the flow of money, of goods, of employment," would have some merit if they were brought forward simply as a platform for immediate struggle.

They are along the general lines of the now discarded progressive policies of the New Deal and some of the economic proposals of the C.I.O. today—the establishment of a permanent P.W.A. to provide two or three billion dollars' worth of investment a year; moderate increases in old-age pensions, with the abolition of social security payroll taxes and the substitution of higher income taxes (here, however, he tends to put emphasis on the taxation of middle incomes); the extension of W.P.A.; and the establishment of a national bank for long-term capital loans, on the lines of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but directed toward providing funds for P.W.A., small business, etc.

The first four of these proposals form a program with which, on the whole, no progressive, least of all a Communist, can disagree in so far as they form the basis of a struggle for the immediate needs of the working class and the people generally, and can become a rallying point for the development of the struggle against monopoly capitalism.

The fifth, his proposal for a national bank for long-term capital loans founded upon the credit of the Federal Government is but a disguised form of inflation, which could result only in the further lowering of the standard of living of the people. The only basis upon which the masses can benefit basically from increased government spending is through sharply increased taxation of the capitalist class, not through inflation, no matter how it is disguised.

The danger of all the proposals is, first, that Mr. Chase, while disclaiming that this is a "cure-all . . . Chase's plan to save the world," in fact maintains that his scheme can do what nothing but the abolition of the capitalist system can do, namely, overcome the contradiction which is inherent in capitalism, the contradiction of an "excess of capital simultaneously with an excess of population," the contradiction between "the conditions under which this surplus value is produced and those under which it is realized."

For, while such an increase in the consuming power of the people would lead to an increase in the production of consumption commodities and therefore to an increase in the production of producers' commodities, the utilization of idle capital would give rise to a further accumulation and the accentuation of the basic contradiction, hence to a new and deeper crisis.

A second danger of Chase's posi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion is that it breeds the illusion that a state controlled by the capitalist class can become the instrument for the lessening of exploitation and for a vast improvement in the living conditions of the masses, overcoming the basic contradictions of capitalism through conscious planning, the utilization of "rules," controls, of "efficient organization." And this at a time when every newspaper headline shows that American capitalism looks, not to the improvement of the standard of living of the American people, but to imperialist war and plunder; not to increased democracy and popular control, but to dictatorship, for the solution of its desperate crisis.

It is not and cannot be in the expansion of the home market, in the improvement of the conditions of the people, that capitalism will seek a solution to the contradiction between the growing productive forces and restricted consumption. Rather it is the historical tendency of capitalism, as the accumulation of capital grows, as it becomes concentrated and centralized in ever fewer hands, to look abroad, to backward colonial and semi-colonial countries, for the investment of its surplus capital and the extraction of super-profits.

That historical tendency, operating as an inexorable law in every advanced capitalist country, has long since led to a complete division of the rest of the world. Hence, the intense struggle between the imperialist powers for a redivision of the world, with force as the final arbiter. Thus far in the twentieth century two horrible wars for a redivision of the world have shown the actual direction of capitalism developed to monopoly capitalism, to imperialism.

A "Shadow Over Wall Street"

One of the characteristics of capitalism in its imperialist stage is the fusion of bank capital with industrial capital, the concentration in the hands of a few families of both the industrial and financial power, so that it becomes impossible to separate one from the other. This fusion is finance capital.

Chase, on the basis of the Temporary National Economic Committee hearings, gives proof of this development when he shows that a very large proportion of investment for replacement and expansion of capital comes today, not through the classical "banking" channels, but out of the depreciation and depletion reserves of the corporations themselves. From this, however, he draws an erroneous conclusion but one which gives comfort to his petty-bourgeois mind—the conclusion that "there is a shadow over Wall Street," that the investment banker is being pushed out as a factor in our economic life.

What he fails to understand, of course, is that even if the new investments financed by, let us say, the House of Morgan, may be decreasing in quantity because, for example, U. S. Steel finances its replacement and expansion of plant from its own reserves (and it is precisely the most powerful corporations of finance capital which have these reserves), nevertheless

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the House of Morgan has by no means lost its influence or its strength. There has simply ceased to be any sharp difference between the House of Morgan and U. S. Steel. Morgan is no more a "banker" than Rockefeller is an "industrialist." Both are finance capitalists, both control vast empires of fused banking and industrial capital—finance capital—and through their representatives turn the state more and more openly into "the executive committee of the capitalist class."

Finance capital is the most rapacious ruling class the world has ever seen. A few families, an oligarchy of wealth and power controlling the vast productive resources of the developed industrial countries, center in their hands the whole control of the life of these countries, the enormous loot derived from the exploitation of the whole population; and they use this power further to exploit the people of the colonial world, carrying on the most colossal wars history has recorded, to dominate the world, to destroy their imperialist rivals, to make the entire population of the world their slaves. The state, whether it centers in Berlin, in London, or in Washington, is no more nor less than an instrument through which they exert their power. Its whole apparatus is but their weapon for the enrichment of themselves and the enslavement of the people.

As the forces of production strengthen and develop, as the contradictions of capitalism, which are not removed but aggravated by the development of monopoly capitalism, deepen and become sharpened, this merger of finance capital with the state becomes more and more open. The finance capitalists themselves step directly into the controlling posts in the government (witness the role of Knudsen, Stettinius, etc.), and the government plays a more direct role in the national economy. Monopoly capitalism develops into state monopoly capitalism.

State capitalism is not a system of production radically different from monopoly capitalism, but is simply the further development of finance capital, in which the monopolists' control of the state is not loosened but tightened.

The working class, the people as a whole, cannot look to the development of such a state as a solution to their problems. Only the organized force of the working class, gathering around itself its natural allies from among the farmers and the city middle classes, on the basis of the class struggle, can prevail against the fierce drive of the monopolists for domination and loot. Only by the abolition of capitalism can the misery-creating "gap between savings and investment," which reflects the contradiction of productive power and consuming power, be eliminated.

The Myth of "Organized Capitalism"

The proposal of Stuart Chase to look to a state controlled lock-stock-and-barrel by finance capital to overcome the contradictions of capitalism, springs from the same ignoring of the real character of finance capital from which spring the ultra-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperialist theory of Kautsky, the "organized capitalism" theory of the counter-revolutionary Bukharin, and the various "planned capitalism" theories of the Social-Democrats.

These myths are being revived again today, after their interment in 1929. They are being revived because they serve the interests of finance capital at a time when it is necessary at all costs to hide the real character of the present war, which arises precisely from the basic contradiction of capitalism, from the fact that capitalism is not and can never be "organized" or "planned."

At the same time these theories serve to blind the masses to the danger of the further union of finance capital and the state, the development of state capitalism, which has already proceeded very far in Germany, Italy, and England, and which with the development of war economy is making rapid headway in the United States.

Further, such theories serve to aid in the confusion of state capitalism with socialism. Writers like Harold Laski (to say nothing of Dorothy Thompson) describe the state monopoly capitalism of Great Britain today as "war socialism," although (or should we say—because) it is exploiting the British working class and the colonial peoples more and more deeply for the benefit of the British ruling class. These theories of Chase and others serve to obscure the character of the state monopoly capitalist regime of Nazi Germany.

Chase says:

"The Germans have cleaned out their rich men and capitalists. Goebbels has publicly announced that all private property is subject to requisition." (p. 242.)

The fact of the matter is that the Nazis have not made an end of "their rich men and capitalists." Fascism, which is the terrorist rule of the most powerful section of monopoly capital fused with the state, hastens the development of state capitalism. But far from this meaning an end of rich men and capitalists, it simply means an intensification of the antagonisms of capitalism, even though these antagonisms may be temporarily repressed by the heavy lid of fascist terror. It has meant the elimination of many individual capitalists and the wolf-like "assimilation" of one group of capitalists by another. But it has resulted in the strengthening of the most powerful and the most rapacious, whose tentacles are intertwined with every department of the state and the Nazi party.

According to reports in the Swiss press, quoted by K. Werner (*The Communist International*, 1938, No. 8): "At the end of 1937 about 70 per cent of industrial production in Germany had become monopolized, as against 40 per cent in 1933." Further, at the end of 1937, the total balance figures of all private banks in Germany amounted to 23,000,000,000 marks. Of this, 83 per cent was shared by the four great Berlin banks.

Jurgen Kuczynski (*Labor Conditions in Western Europe*, International Publishers, New York) has shown that in the first three years

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Hitler's rule gross real wages in Germany went steadily downward, from an index of 112 to 105; and this neglects completely the deductions through forced contributions of one kind and another, forced saving, etc., which are so important a part of the exploitation of the working class in Germany, deductions which have reached colossal proportions with the development of the second imperialist war, amounting to more than 25 per cent of gross wages.

As far as the "right of requisition of private property" is concerned, a right equally possessed by the British war dictatorship, its use by a government controlled from top to bottom by the most powerful groups of monoply capitalism is unquestionably directed, not against monopoly capitalism, but against the people, against small producers, against the weaker capitalists.

Is State Capitalism "Organized Capitalism"?

State capitalism means a certain measure of greater organization of capitalist production, made necessary by the greatly intensified contradiction between the socialized forces of production and the capitalist property relations. The magnitude of the forces of production created by capitalism and particularly the acute antagonisms engendered by it, render it necessary to resort to a greater degree of centralization. As accumulation of capital, which reflects this growth of the forces of production, brought about the development of monopoly from the earlier scattered free-competitive capitalism, so today it creates the necessity of still further centralization, the wielding of the power of the capitalist class over the national economy more and more through the state machine.

But despite this measure of organization, state capitalism is not "organized capitalism," "planned capitalism." It does not and cannot do away with the contradictions of capitalism which arise from the basic contradiction of socialized production and private appropriation, even though this private control is centralized through the capitalist state.

In fact, state capitalism is rather evidence of, and in turn adds to, the tremendous intensification of these strains and contradictions. It intensifies the contradictions internally by increasing the immense power of a smaller and smaller group of finance capitalists at the expense of the entire population, with a tendency toward ever greater impoverishment of this population. It sharpens the class antagonism between the capitalists and the working class, while at the same time it increases the antagonisms between the ruling oligarchy and other sections of the capitalist class itself. Internationally, the consolidation of the power of finance capital in each of the imperialist countries deepens and sharpens the struggle between the imperialist countries and the colonial countries and enormously heightens the conflicts between the different imperialist powers.

The need of establishing state

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monopoly capitalism is the best proof of the inability of capitalism to overcome its contradictions, the best proof of the depth of the contradiction between the socialized forces of production and the private ownership of the means of production, of the maturity of the material pre-conditions for socialism.

"State monopoly capitalism is the fullest *material* preparation for socialism, it is its *threshold,* it is that rung on the historical ladder between which and the rung called socialism there are *no intervening rungs.*" (V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. IX, p. 171, International Publishers, New York.)

If the capitalist class has to utilize the state to operate the national economy, then how long will it be before the working class asks the question: Since centralized control of production is necessary in any case, why should it not be centralized control *by the masses* for social purposes? Why should not state monopoly capitalism, which is the highest possible stage of development of the contradiction of capitalism, be transformed into its opposite, into socialism, through the destruction of the power of the capitalist class?

How long will it be before the contradiction between social production and private ownership is exposed for everyone to see?

* * *

It is Chase's inability to see this contradiction which makes it impossible for him to find the solution to the problems which he poses. His blindness is reflected in his whole method, the method of extreme eclecticism in history, of "logical positivism" in philosophy.

To Chase all problems can be solved by finding the right word, by freeing ourselves from the shackles of out-moded words. "Capitalism" is only a word; hence, it would not do to seek the reasons for the situation in which the world finds itself today in the character of capitalism. There is no such thing. There are only individual capitalists, good or bad. "When you say 'monopoly is terrible,' I want to know what corporations or other enterprises you refer to." (p. 41.)

He scorns the "dogmas of a Karl Marx"; he rejects that scientific approach to the problems of society which only Marx's historical materialism gives; and, looking for a basic cause for the crisis in which he finds our society, he falls back for an explanation upon the thesis that it is due to the fact that the population has ceased to expand, that the population curve, which will reach its highest point between 1960 and 1980, is leveling off.

But though such a trend is true of the United States and of capitalist Europe, the 1939 census of the Soviet Union shows that between 1926 and 1939 the population increased by 23,000,000, or 15.9 per cent (excluding the new territories liberated in 1939), as compared to 8.7 per cent for the rest of Europe. The population increased at the rate of 1.23 per cent per year in the Soviet Union, while in France the rate was 0.08 per cent per year, in Britain 0.36 per cent, in Ger-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many 0.62 per cent, and in the United States 0.67 per cent.

It is not the decline in the growth of population which causes the crisis of capitalism; it is the crisis of capitalism, with the agony it brings for the masses, which causes the decline in the growth of population.

* * *

The contradictions of capitalism are not an accidental effect of this or that chance circumstance. They cannot be ironed out of capitalism like wrinkles, by a "slight change of direction," by some reforms or other. The tragic "paradox" of want in the midst of plenty cannot be eliminated from a system built upon the exploitation of the working class, a system in which the motive for production is the accumulation of surplus value. It can only be eliminated by eliminating the capitalist property relations; our economy can only begin to achieve its "limitless possibilities" of development as the economy of a socialist society, of such a system of society as has already been created in the Soviet Union.

As Earl Browder has pointed out:

"It we could multiply the American national income even less than half as fast [as the Soviet Union has done], say, four times in ten years, and be producing around 275,000,000,000 annually by 1950, that alone would be sufficient to relieve the strains of the whole world and put mankind on its feet again." (Earl Browder, *The Second Imperialist War*, p. 203, International Publishers, New York.)

That would mean, and could mean, an income of over $2,000 a year for *every man, woman, and child* in the country, in place of a situation where today over *one-quarter of the families and single individuals* in the United States, according to the National Resources Committee, have an income of less than $750, and almost half of the population under $1,000 a year.

There is no other basic answer for the masses but the elimination of the capitalist mode of production, the elimination of the contradiction between private ownership and social production, the road of struggle against monopoly capital, the road of struggle for socialism.

As the working class organizes itself for this decisive conflict, it fights, together with its allies, for every measure which brings an amelioration in its conditions of existence without hampering its independence of action. Some of Stuart Chase's proposals are of the kind for which the working class and all American progressives have fought and will continue to fight as such ameliorative measures. His program, as he brings it forward, however, as a basic solution to the economic problems of today, can serve only to create misleading illusions, to divert attention from the correct analysis and the correct solution, to hamper the struggle for freedom from monopoly capitalism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOLLOW MEN

By MICHAEL GOLD

A brilliant polemical study of the literary renegades who deserted the cause of the people, the cause of peace and progress, when tested under fire. Based on a series of articles in the DAILY WORKER, entitled "The Great Tradition: Can the Literary Renegades Destroy It?" the author incisively analyzes the role of the writer in relation to the masses and the revolutionary class struggle. In contrast with the literary renegades who have revealed themselves as faithful servants of the imperialist bourgeoisie, the author points to the writers who are today carrying forward the traditions of John Reed and Randolph Bourne, and have taken their places on the side of the masses. Price 25 cents

●

BRIGHT AND MORNING STAR

By RICHARD WRIGHT

This short story by Richard Wright, author of NATIVE SON and UNCLE TOM'S CHILDREN, and recipient of the Spingarn medal for 1940, vividly unfolds the story of the last hours and heroic death of a Negro Communist organizer among the sharecroppers of the deep South. His torture and murder by a lynch mob bent on forcing him to reveal the names of his comrades, and the dramatic events related to his violent death constitute one of the really great literary works of modern times. Price 10 cents

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3 NEW BOOKS

WE ARE MANY

By Ella Reeve Bloor

Friend and co-worker of such outstanding figures as V. I. Lenin, Eugene Debs, Charles E. Ruthenberg, William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, "Big Bill" Haywood, Tom Mann, Sacco and Vanzetti, Clara Zetkin, and a host of others, Mother Bloor's autobiography is the story of five decades of struggle and achievement in the cause of labor and socialism. 320 pages. Price $2.25.

LABOR IN WARTIME

By John Steuben

Trade unionists will find in this factual and well-documented account of the experiences of American workers during the last war a full expose of the schemes used by the Government, the employers and the reactionary trade union leaders to harness labor to the war plans of Big Capital. 160 pages. Price $1.00.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE STATE

By Frederick Engels

In this work, which appears in a new improved edition, Engels traces the universal transition, among peoples in all parts of the globe, from primitive savagery through the various stages of barbarism to civilization, indicating when the state first comes into existence, with the appearance of private property. 160 pages. Price $1.00.

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED